

THE
Lutheran
Quarterly



Volume III

MAY, 1951

Number 2

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume III

MAY, 1951

Number 2

CONTENTS

AN EVANGELICAL OPINION ON THE PROCLAMATION OF THE DOGMA OF THE BODILY ASSUMPTION OF MARY	Edmund Schlink et al. 123
CONTEMPORARY CULTS AS A PRODUCT OF THEIR ENVIRONMENT	Theodore G. Tappert 142
THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE	Regin Prenter 156
A LUTHERAN SINGAPORE	Harold Floreen 167
CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES	Karl H. Hertz 182
NOTES AND STUDIES	
Cross and Creation	H. T. Lehmann 201
President or Bishop	George Drach 206
BOOK REVIEWS	
Pritchard, <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i> (A. J. Engelbrecht)	212
Meek, <i>Hebrew Origins</i> (W. H. Cooper)	213
Colwell, Kraeling, and Parvis, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls</i>	216
Williamson, <i>Moses, Who First Saw Our Pyramid of Life</i> (H. L. Creager)	216
Lofts, <i>Esther</i> (C. M. Cooper)	217
Goodspeed, <i>A Life of Jesus</i> (E. H. Wahlstrom)	217
Lohmeyer, <i>Das Vaterunser</i> (R. T. Stamm)	218
Moe, <i>The Apostle Paul: His Life and Work</i> (J. W. Heikkinen)	221
Little, <i>Explanation of the Book of Revelation</i> (E. E. Flack)	222
Magary, <i>Saints Without Halos</i> (W. C. Berkemeyer)	223
Bainton, <i>Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther</i> (P. H. Roth)	224
Schwiebert, <i>Luther and his Times</i> (T. G. Tappert)	226
Barr, <i>Monk in Armour</i> (P. H. Buehring)	227
Stapel, <i>Luthers Lieder und Gedichte</i> (R. H. Fischer)	228
Lilje, <i>Luther</i> (O. Nothhacksberger)	229
Vermeil, Hahn, and Bras, <i>Les Églises en Allemagne</i> (H. A. Preus)	230
Loewenich, <i>Menschsein und Christsein bei Augustin, Luther, Burckhardt</i>	231
Hök, <i>Herrnhutisk Teologi i Svensk Gestalt</i> (C. Bergendoff)	231
Hofrenning, <i>Captain Jens Munk's Septentrionalis</i>	232
Ebersole, <i>Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital</i> (R. E. Van Deusen)	232
Ramsey, <i>Basic Christian Ethics</i> (E. C. Fendt)	233
Richardson, <i>The Gospel and Modern Thought</i> (C. G. Carlfelt)	233
Bosley, <i>A Firm Faith for Today</i> (C. C. Rasmussen)	235
Nordquist, <i>Praktisk Psykologi</i> (A. D. Mattson)	236
Menn, <i>Oekumenischer Katechismus</i> (O. N. Olson)	236
Pleijel, <i>Kyrkohistoriska arkivet i Lund</i> (O. N. Olson)	236
Norrbrink, <i>Vårt Kyrko-År</i> (O. N. Olson)	237
Polack, <i>Beside Still Waters</i> (A. J. Traver)	237
Hay, <i>Blind Spot in Public Education</i> (R. D. Heim)	237
Melin, <i>Konfirmationen i nitidsdebatten</i> (O. N. Olson)	237
Silver, <i>The Way to God</i> (C. M. Cooper)	238
Bammel, <i>Das heilige Mahl</i> (J. Aberly)	238
CONTRIBUTORS	240

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor

THEODORE S. LIEFELD

Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager

ANDREW S. BURGESS

Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

GETTYSBURG, PA.

Harvey D. Hoover

Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Paul J. Hoh

T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

C. G. Carlfelt

Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

COLUMBUS, OHIO

E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

DUBUQUE, IOWA

Bernard Holm

AIMS AND POLICY

- I. *Aims*: The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.
- II. *Policy*: The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

An Evangelical Opinion on the Proclamation of the Dogma of the Bodily Assumption of Mary¹

EDMUND SCHLINK ET AL.

FOREWORD

As members of churches who feel a responsibility towards each other though our churches are divided, we have in recent years met in Evangelical-Roman Catholic colloquies on exegetical and dogmatic questions of a biblical nature. In connection with these colloquies Evangelical theologians have expressed serious scruples concerning the anticipated action making the Assumption of Mary a dogma of the church. These scruples are summarized in the following statement. It was formulated as an Evangelical contribution to the intra-Catholic discussion of the problems of the dogma while it was still an open question. At the same time it sought clearly to express that before such an important question Evangelical theology was conscious of a responsibility toward the whole Christian Church as well as toward the Church of the Reformation. This statement, directed thus to the Roman Church, was drawn up by Professor Edmund Schlink with the cooperation of his colleagues at Heidelberg, Günther Bornkamm, Peter Brunner, Hans von Campenhausen and Wilfrid Joest. It was completed in June, 1950, and referred to Roman Catholic theological consideration by Bishop Stählin. It is in the hope that knowledge of this Evangelical-theological warning and point of view may be of value to the ecumenically minded that it now is made public.

In the period of the National-Socialists' suppression and persecution of the Christian faith, the Evangelical and the Roman

1 Probably no event in the history of doctrine since the Reformation has equalled in significance the proclamation by the Roman Church of the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary, in December, 1950. Lutheran scholars in Europe saw the implications of the act and in the summer of 1950 issued a plea against it. The appeal was fruitless, but the statement of Prof. Schlink at Heidelberg and of his colleagues remains a significant document. It is one of the clearest utterances of our day on the basis of the Evangelical faith as compared with what has become the source of Roman Catholic doctrine. The document has been translated by the Editor and is printed in the QUARTERLY with the permission of Prof. Schlink.—Ed.

Churches in Germany drew closer together. This movement continued even after the collapse of the Third Reich. It was not only the fact of a common political interest, or the need of a common protest against the anti-Christian nature of the National-Socialistic philosophy that brought the churches together, but, beyond that, the feeling of a certain attraction of each toward the other.

For neither side did this approach imply a change in the area of dogma or church polity. Now as before each of the churches insisted on its own catholicity and remained firm in its own doctrine and practice. Nor did any considerable number of conversions from either church take place.

Still it is undeniable that the Evangelical and the Roman Churches in Germany—both in regard to clergy and laity—confront each other today quite differently than before. For centuries the emphasis had been on the mutual lines of division, on the elaboration of distinctive differences, the underlining of error, mistakes and weaknesses of the other side, often, too, on distorted presentations of the history and doctrine of the opposing church. Both churches had assumed an attitude of strangeness to each other and an open or concealed attitude of unapproachability.

The persecution by the anti-Christian authorities, however, awakened in both churches a new willingness to listen to the witness of each other. In their common distress Evangelical Christians have unexpectedly recognized the voice of the Good Shepherd in the witness of the Roman Church, and Roman Catholics have confessed to a similar experience with regard to the Evangelical Church. The old polemical estrangement gave way to a search for brothers in the other church, a joy in the truth even if it were found in the other church, an admission of the working of God's grace even across our church boundaries. The Third Reich was a source of shame and penitence for both churches and gave rise to a reconsideration of the nature of the divisions within the faith and to a re-examination of the previous judgments of each church on the dogmas and history of the other. There was a new awakening of the consciousness of God's will for unity and of the sorrows

caused by separation. This spirit led to mutual fruitfulness and to many practical deeds of love on both sides. In His seeking love God had made possible the beginning of a new approach of the churches to each other, and the yearning for the realization of the Lord's plea "that all might be one" (John 17:20 f.) is stronger in Germany than ever it has been.

In this situation what, as far as humans can see, will happen if there now be proclaimed the dogma of the Assumption of Mary, understood as a bodily resurrection and assumption of Mary which has already taken place? In answering this question we are not dealing with the arguments for and against as they arise from the presuppositions of Roman dogma, but limit ourselves to an answer based on evangelical theology (making here no distinction between Lutheran and Reformed theology).

THE DOGMATIC CONSIDERATION

The foundation of the teaching of the church is the teaching of the Apostles. This is the profession of the Roman as well as of the Evangelical Church. For the foundation of the church is Jesus Christ, and to Him the apostles bear witness who were called by Him to be eye-witnesses of His words and deeds, of His passion and above all of His resurrection. The apostolic witness includes likewise therefore also the interpretation of the Old Testament word of God, which Jesus Christ confirmed, fulfilled, and revealed. In this sense the apostolic proclamation is the ultimate basis of the teaching of the church, to which no one can or ought to add anything, since the revelation of God to His church on earth was completed in Jesus Christ. God "hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Hebrews 1:2).

The fundamental question of Christian theology must therefore be stated thus: Is the bodily resurrection and Assumption of Mary a part of apostolic teaching? The answer to this question is decided by a) the basis of the proposed doctrine; b) its relationship to the entire body of apostolic teaching.

A. DOGMATIC EXAMINATION OF THE BASIS

1. The Holy Scriptures admittedly never mention the Assumption of Mary (the last reference is to her belonging to the original congregation in Jerusalem, Acts 1:14). This fact is all the more important inasmuch as the apostolic witness has come to us in the New Testament not only directly through apostolic writings, but also indirectly, namely in the writings of the disciples of the Apostles. The New Testament writings therefore do not bear witness only of the faith of the first generation in the church. More than this the New Testament statements about the resurrection make it highly improbable that a bodily resurrection of Mary might be placed between the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the first fruits of those raised from the dead, and the resurrection of the faithful or of all mankind at the return of Jesus Christ. The words of Paul about the order in time of those who are raised (I Corinthians 15:23 f.) provide for no such possibility, and this is true also of the other New Testament writings (e.g. II Timothy 2:18 and Revelation 20:4-6). They know only of a sacramental, but of no bodily resurrection of the faithful before the return of the Lord. It is also clear from those many statements of doctrine in the New Testament which are almost in the nature of creedal formulae that the Assumption of Mary did not belong to the faith which the Apostles and the early church preached as necessary for salvation. In the absence of any statement about the Assumption of Mary in the writings of the New Testament, it is hardly possible to derive such a statement by allegorical interpretation out of Genesis 3:15 or Revelation 11:19 or from a combination of these passages with Luke 1:28.

2. The silence of tradition during the first five centuries is as absolute as that of the canonical Scriptures. Attempts to find witness for the Assumption as early as in the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries have proved scientifically untenable. Jerome and Epiphanius especially, who might be expected to furnish some evidence because of their great learning in the traditions of the church have nothing to say concerning the Assumption of Mary.

Indeed Epiphanius expressly declared that nothing certain is known of the fate of Mary. So also Athanasius, Ambrosius and Augustine not only are silent about the Assumption, but express themselves so clearly concerning Christ as the only One risen in an eschatological-bodily form and concerning the future resurrection of *all* other persons on the day of the Parousia that there is no place in their thinking for a knowledge of a resurrection of Mary which has already taken place. The idea of an Assumption of Mary is first found in the undoubtedly legendary "Translation of Mary," to which no historically based traditional value can be attached, and which the church officially discounted as apocryphal even as early as the sixth century. When the Fathers of the sixth to eighth centuries teach the Assumption of Mary they give no literary or oral tradition as the basis of their teaching. Rather, they derive it as a theological consequence under the influence of the "Translation" legend. Modestus of Jerusalem even expressly declared that the earlier teachers of the church and their followers had handed down nothing concerning the fate of Mary. In view of these facts we need not take into account the emergence of an apostolic tradition of the Assumption of Mary in the statements of later centuries even to our day.

A similar situation meets us in the development of the liturgy. Even if there is evidence for the Festival of the Assumption of Mary in the sixth century, probably even earlier, the concept of "Assumption" was for nearly a century synonymous with "sleep," or "cessation," or "translation of the spirit," and in no sense identical with bodily resurrection and ascension. Even the current form of the Roman Missal contains no statement which must be understood as a reference to the ascension of the glorified body of Mary. The Roman Breviary up to the reform of 1568 even included the words of Pseudo-Jerome that the church did not know what happened to the body of Mary after her death.

In these circumstances the idea of the Assumption of Mary cannot be considered as an apostolical doctrine, handed down orally by the side of the canonical Scriptures of the New Testament. Well-known Roman dogmaticians have declared that it is impos-

sible to find historical evidence for the tradition of the Assumption of Mary. For this doctrine none of the three criteria of the formula of Vincent of Lerins is present ("what is believed in every place, at every time, and by every one—this indeed is truly and properly catholic"). Furthermore it can be shown that neither in the doctrine as contained in the New Testament writings nor as witnessed to by the Church Fathers of the first five centuries was the recognition of the Assumption of Mary considered necessary for salvation. Otherwise this silence must mean that they did not proclaim the full message of salvation.

3. Since it is impossible to produce proof that the bodily resurrection and Assumption of Mary was a part of the apostolic doctrine, evangelical judgment is against the declaration of a doctrine of the Assumption. The basis of such a doctrine seems to be speculative inferences drawn from the unique favors granted Mary and the parallelism between Eve and Mary. But even if the Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception could be given a Scriptural foundation, the absence of any apostolic witness to the Assumption could not be compensated for by inferences. Even the most favorable examination of the arguments and proofs which Roman theology presents in place of evidence from Scripture and tradition can lead at best only to the result of a possibility, not—in the absence of apostolic witness—to a reality of the Assumption. For the Assumption means of course an earthly event, namely, the transfiguration and removal of the earthly body of Mary, an historical act in God's redemption. The anti-docetic nature of the divine revelation finds profound expression in the witness of both the Old and New Testament that God has made known the acts of redemption through human eye-witnesses. In the matter of the Assumption therefore theological inferences cannot be substituted for eye-witnesses. Furthermore the history of Mariology shows that with the method of speculative inference still other possibilities emerge from the presupposition of this same uniqueness of the favors granted Mary: for instance, that Mary never died but was caught up in heaven, or that though she died, her body remained incorruptible in the grave and her soul was taken to heaven.

A careful analysis of the speculative inferences in favor of the Assumption reveals various motives, without any necessary internal relationship. In one case the purpose is a further step in the glorification of the mother of the Lord. In another, the aim is a symbolical expression for the doctrine of man exalted by the grace of God, or for the doctrine of the church as bride and spouse of Christ, and Mary is chosen as this symbol and thus her Assumption is required. But neither the seriousness of these motives nor the depth of these speculations can conceal the fact that the Assumption of Mary was never an apostolic proclamation.

This is not to say that we should on principle discard proof by inference, that is, the attempt to prove the propriety or necessity of certain acts of God by logical inferences from theological premises. But in the question of the Assumption of Mary it is not justified since there is a lack of apostolic witness. Quite different, for instance, is Anselm's use of it in his work *Cur Deus Homo*—the classic example of this form of proof. Where Anselm seeks to prove the necessity of the Incarnation "without reference to Christ, as if he had never lived" (Preface), he presupposes the creed of the church as well as the apostolic witness to the Incarnation and seeks to confirm these, that is, he seeks to show the reasonable connection between the nature of God and the deeds He has certified to us. But he does not propose on the basis of reasoning by inference alone to teach redemptive acts of God for which there is no witness of Scriptures or tradition.

4. Were a church or its teachers to make a dogma out of a past bodily resurrection and assumption of Mary, it would, from an evangelical point of view, thereby not be following the authority of the apostolic teaching but breaking loose from it. Such a church would be acting without apostolic sanction and thus without divine commission, and be defining on its own authority what is necessary for salvation. It would pretend to be able to create apostolic doctrine, whereas its commission reads that it should preserve and explain in its purity the historically transmitted teachings of the apostles. It would create redemptive acts, whereas it can only base

itself on them and further confirm them. It would be exalting itself above the Apostles.

B. DOGMATIC EXAMINATION OF THE CONTENT

1. Consequences for Mariology.

The church confesses, on the basis of Holy Scripture, its faith in "Jesus Christ, the Only-Begotten Son of God, our Lord, conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary" (Apostles' Creed). As the earthly mother of the eternal Son of God and in this sense Theotokos (bearer of God), Mary is inseparably related to the divine redemptive act of the Incarnation of the eternal Word of God and occupies a unique place in the whole of the human race. The church can never fail to recognize the earthly mother of Jesus without forfeiting the reality of the Incarnation to docetism. That God through the Holy Spirit prepared in the body of Mary for the Incarnation of His eternal Son was entirely a work of the divine grace which descended on Mary and enabled her to believe in the promise.

When the church recalls the earthly mother of its heavenly Lord, it must be mindful not only of the story of the Nativity but also the other statements which the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles recount about her. Even though she was the blessed mother of Jesus Christ, she did not understand Him (Luke 2:50) and had to be reproached by Him (John 2:4). Even though she was the blessed mother, Jesus allowed her to stand outside and referring to his disciples said, "Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother" (Mark 3:34-5). It is in this same context that we are told that His kinsmen claimed, "He is beside himself" (Mark 3:21). The Gospels picture the blessed mother, too, as a woman whose faith was tested, and whose sorrow was caused not only by the suffering of her Son, but also by her lack of understanding of His way. When in spite of these trials and sorrows she is found after the resurrection of Jesus together with the other women and the brethren in the unity of faith and in continued

supplication with the Apostles (Acts 1:14) this is as much the result of the grace of God as is the faith of the Apostles. We are not informed that she had any unusual place in the early church and therefore it is not surprising that tradition is silent concerning the end of her life.

What makes her remembrance precious and comforting to the evangelical Christian is just this two-fold testimony of the New Testament writings: Mary, the earthly mother of the eternal Son of God and the humble member of the early church; Mary, taken into divine service in a unique manner, and the troubled soul. Just therefore is she an example of faith. Both in her election to be the bearer of God and in the trials of the suffering mother her life is an unforgettable thanksgiving for divine grace.

Through the dogma of the Assumption, however, Mary would be still more fully taken out of the fellowship of the church and further removed from the waiting people of God than already is the case in Roman doctrine and devotion. She would no longer be the member of the congregation, waiting together with all the faithful on earth and the saints in heaven for the resurrection, but would confront us as one belonging to an entirely different order than the church. Thus would be obscured the peculiar comfort of the biblical witness to the blessed and troubled mother of Jesus who as an humble member of the original congregation shared in its faith, its prayer, its expectation. Even more, there would be placed before us in the image of the exalted Mary a picture of perfect humanity which the witness of the Scriptures does not permit us yet to see realized in any other human being beside the exalted Christ. On the right hand of God He still does not cease to be man; concealed in the Gospel and sacraments he now meets us as our Lord and Brother and renews us, but the time will come when He will meet us visible to all and will transform us into the likeness of His glory. Still we wait along with all creation for that glory which He will reveal to us. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be" (I John 3:2).

2. Consequences for Christology.

The church confesses on the basis of Holy Scripture, its faith

in Jesus Christ as the Son of God become man, the one Lord, the king of kings, the only mediator between God and man. Jesus Christ is our atonement, our justification, our sanctification, our salvation. In Him we have our access to God. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). Jesus Christ is the sole Mediator and Redeemer. As such He alone will confront on the last day *all* created beings and *all* will appear before Him as their Lord. The confession of faith in the *sole* Redeemer is closely related to the confession of faith in the returning Lord who will judge *all* and to whom all must answer on the day of resurrection, be it to life or to death.

Through the dogma of the Assumption of Mary a decisive further step would be taken in the direction of placing beside the way, the work, and the titles of Jesus Christ a corresponding way and work and corresponding titles of Mary and teaching them together. Jesus Christ is without original sin—so also Mary. Jesus Christ is bodily arisen and ascended into heaven—so also Mary. Christ is Lord and King—Mary is Lady and Queen. Jesus Christ is Mediator and Redeemer—Mary is Co-Mediator and Co-Redeemer. Even the titles of a "daughter of God" and "goddess" were already bestowed on Mary in medieval Mariology and a revival of this tendency could lead not only to the creation now of a dogma of the Assumption but beyond that likewise to the making of a dogma of Mary as Co-Redeemer and Co-Mediator.

It is admitted that Roman dogmatics does not think of Christ and Mary in identical terms as to way, work and titles, but in terms like I John 3:2, that is, recognizing the difference between Jesus Christ as the Only-Begotten Son of God and Mary as a blessed creature. Christ is Lord and King because of His divine nature, Mary is Lady and Queen because of the redeeming work of Christ and only as His helper. Christ is Mediator and Redeemer as the Incarnate Son of God, Mary is helper in His work of redemption because she has been redeemed by Him. She is the creature who receives eternal life by grace, Christ as Son of God is that life. Despite the extensive parallelism Mariology remains but

an appendix to Christology, and the difference between prayer and worship does maintain itself.

Despite these dogmatic distinctions the dogma of the Assumption of Mary and the consequent extension of the parallelism between Jesus Christ and Mary would, in the judgment of Evangelicals, compromise the honor due Jesus Christ, our only Lord and Saviour. For the dogma of the Assumption of Mary would obscure the difference between the absolute uniqueness of Jesus Christ and *all* created beings. Even if the promise to the faithful is that they shall be transformed into a glory like unto that of Christ and shall reign with Him, the basic difference remains that Christ alone is the Lamb who bore the sin of the world, He alone is Mediator and Atonement. Furthermore this promise is given, in the Holy Scriptures, to *all* the faithful. The dogma of the Assumption of Mary, however, would destroy the eschatological antithesis of Jesus Christ, the first fruits of the resurrection, and the human race looking for His coming, the eschatological antithesis of the returning Redeemer and the redeemed who await Him. Even if it is emphasized that Mary is and remains a created being she would nevertheless be taken out of the ranks of the awaiting creation and would stand with Christ facing those waiting. If, however, it is argued that it is just the image of the new humanity that is presented to us in the picture of the exalted Mary, it should be made clear that Jesus Christ, too, is not only the Son of God but true man. He is not only arisen by His own power, but also raised by God the Father. He is not only the Lord, but at the same time the servant of God. As the Exalted He is and remains also man. He is the new humanity. In Him, Who is both exalted Lord and new man, we find everything that the modern literature of Mariology increasingly associates with Mary. The doctrine of the Assumption would in reality not leave Christology unaffected. Rather, extending Christological designations to Mary would obscure the whole redemptive work of the Son of God and most especially the doctrine of the Incarnation.

3. Consequences for the Faith.

Making the Assumption a dogma would be an addition to dog-

mas already proclaimed and mean a new obligation required for faith. Faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the expectation of the resurrection of the faithful on the day of His return would no longer be considered sufficient, but faith in the Assumption of Mary would also be necessary for salvation. This essential change would alter at the same time the nature of faith as defined in the New Testament.

In faith the sinner owns Jesus Christ as his Lord, through whom God calls him, promises him forgiveness and life and claims his service. In faith man despite anything visible clings to the Invisible God revealed in Jesus Christ and receives the active grace of God. The personal meeting of God in Christ and man takes place in faith's acceptance and confidence and thus is realized the history of God's great deeds of redemption toward his people, in whom the believer is incorporated. What the Gospels say about faith in the Christ who walked the earth, the other New Testament writings say about faith in the Gospels which the Apostles proclaimed and about a believing reception of the Sacraments. For in Word and Sacrament we meet the exalted Christ Himself. The Gospel is "the power of God" (Romans 1:16).

According to the evangelical standpoint a faith in the Assumption of Mary would not be on the same level as the New Testament definition of faith. Faith in Mary in the New Testament conception of faith is impossible as long as it has to be maintained that one can honor but not pray to her, that she is a blessed creature but not a source of blessing. Faith would be misdirected from a meeting with the living God to a deed of God toward another human being, or from a meeting with God to a human being whom God has confronted. But, also, faith would be deflected from the apostolic witness through which the exalted Christ calls us, since this witness knows of no assumption of Mary with any redemptive meaning for faith. Faith would thereby lose the element of its assurance that it agrees with the faith of the Apostles. Faith in the Assumption of Mary would no longer be the New Testament faith in the God who meets us in Jesus Christ.

Even if one might attempt to make a positive distinction be-

tween faith in Christ and faith in the Gospel by differentiations analogous to *credere in* and *credere* with the accusative case (as "I believe in God the Father," but "I believe one holy Church"), at least the average Christian would feel that such dogmatic niceties were beyond him. Roman Catholics themselves have criticized certain popular forms of Mariological devotion which make clear that even the aforementioned dogmatical differences with regard to the similarity of the works and titles of Christ and Mary go over the heads of the average Christian. The average Christian considers dogmatic distinction abstract and remote and for him the dogma of the Assumption would markedly increase the peril of a shift in his faith in Christ.

4. Ecclesiological Consequences.

The church to which is given the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it (Matthew 16:18) is the apostolic. Only then is the church the one, holy, and catholic church which in the changes of history is and remains the same until the day of Christ's return, if it preserves the apostolic teaching in the obedience of faith, that is, teaches that and that alone without the addition of something new.

The apostolic character of the Church of Rome and thus the reality of the church in the Church of Rome would, in the judgment of Evangelicals, be still more open to question by a creation of a dogma of the Assumption of Mary than already was the case in the eyes of the Reformers. The Reformation had its origin in the fact that a large portion of Christendom at that time no longer was able to recognize the central doctrines of the Apostles in the teachings of the Roman Church. Yet, despite all differences in the interpretation of the apostolic teachings and in the answer to the question, where the historical apostolic teachings could be found, it remained undeniable that in principle Roman dogmatics recognized the teachings of the apostles as being alone normative in character. On this account the Roman Church continued to be a serious challenge to the Evangelical Church and a healthy irritant to Protestant self-assurance. But the creation of a dogma of the Assumption would signify to Evangelical theology more than an

erring interpretation of the biblical, apostolic teaching, more, also, than a differing answer to the problem where to find the historical apostolic teaching. It would mean the abandonment of the teachings of the Apostles as the basis of the doctrines of the church. And that could mean nothing less than a fundamental questioning of the apostolicity of the Roman Church.

RESULTS AS TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EVANGELICAL AND ROMAN CHURCHES

A dogma of the bodily resurrection and ascension of Mary would without doubt increase the number of differences between the Roman and the Evangelical Churches and deepen the cleft between the beliefs of the two churches. The Evangelical Church would see in this dogma not only a difference in the Roman *interpretation* of the apostolic doctrine but a fundamental departure on Rome's part from an apostolic *foundation* for its doctrine, and such a dogma could therefore only call forth a painful alienation of the Evangelicals. The Evangelical Christian, basing his faith on Holy Scripture, can in no way accept this dogma, but neither can he overlook it as an adiaphoron or leave it as an open question, but can only take cognizance of it with sorrow and expressly deny it.

The drawing together which the Evangelical and the Roman Churches experienced during the period of persecution would, by human estimate, be severely affected by the dogma of the Assumption of Mary. For the closer approach had its real basis in the happy mutual discovery that in time of great distress we could hear something of the comfort of the apostolic Gospel from the lips of members of a church separated from our own. It was this discovery that made possible the new earnestness with which both sides engaged in biblical theological work with each other. This same discovery prompted the Evangelical theology to a reexamination of the problems of tradition in the church. On the basis of this discovery both sides were prepared for a new interpretation of the teaching and history of the other church in a spirit of peni-

tence. All this would be paralyzed by the proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption. For it would become obvious that the Holy Scriptures could not really be the norm for the Roman Church in regard to that which is required for saving faith, and that therefore common study of biblical theology could be of only secondary importance in all the striving for the unity of the church. Furthermore it would become apparent that scholarly research in the church's traditions in these matters would lead to no result, since the Roman Church today no longer builds on apostolic tradition, either historically demonstrable or even only probable, but on its pretension to be able itself to create "apostolic tradition." Theological conversation between the Evangelical and Roman Churches, too, would suffer a heavy handicap by virtue of the fact that the creation of the dogma of the Assumption could not otherwise take place than by an authoritarian annulment of universally accepted results of scholarly research. This would cast serious doubt on the importance of scholarly work in theology. From the standpoint of Evangelical thinkers it would be hard to understand how such Roman theologians could really sincerely believe this dogma who gave their assent after the dogma was proclaimed but who before the proclamation had registered well-grounded objections. Even the Evangelical theologian knows that the Holy Spirit can render decisions by the voice of the church against the theological position of the individual. But the authenticity of the Spirit proves itself in that it brings to remembrance the historical word of Jesus (John 14:26) and does not speak from himself (John 16:13).

At the same time the dogma of the Assumption would undoubtedly give significant and motivated impetus to those groups in Protestantism who previously were suspicious of the rapprochement between the Evangelical and Roman Churches, saw only dangers in it, and who now as before consider a strict political aloofness as the only correct attitude toward the Roman Church. Those groups are not in control today in the Evangelical Church in Germany, but they could then again come to power, and we would once more have the old deplorable situation of each church being

estranged from the other and each unsympathetically fighting the other.

It is certain that not only in Germany but in the whole ecumenical church the making a dogma of the Assumption would be interpreted not merely as a specific point of doctrine but far more as a basic trend of the Roman Church. Nor would this be true only in the matter of the fundamental relationship of the church and apostolic teaching, but also in the matter of the general position of the Roman Church toward the manifold endeavors looking to a drawing closer of the churches everywhere in the world. While today the majority of churches with tears of penitence confess before God that they share in the guilt of a divided Body of Christ, and in common prayer and serious scholarly effort seek to diminish the area of disagreement and increase the area of agreement—without overlooking differences not yet removed—and to give witness of this to the world, the Roman Church would increase the area of disagreement by a dogma of the Assumption. Creation of a dogma of the Assumption would be interpreted today in the midst of the efforts at closer relationships between the churches as a fundamental veto on the part of the Roman Church. It would be so understood not only by the Evangelical Church in Germany, but also by the Protestants of the world and by Orthodox Christendom. This is the more significant when one reflects on the possibilities which the Roman Church has to develop other dogmas and new interpretations of existing dogmas on the basis of its own principles, and thereby instead of alienating might the rather influence the other churches spurring them on, yes, even setting them an example.

RESULTS ON THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE CHURCHES AND THE WORLD

The churches today live in a world which has become de-Christianized and anti-Christian. On all fronts they are attacked by atheistic world-views and bolshevistic communism's marshalling of the masses. But no less ominous is the mass appearance of the

secularized man who nominally still belongs to a church but has lost living faith in the reality of the great redemptive acts of God as these are proclaimed in the Word and sacrament of worship. It is these, the multitudes, who have fallen victims to the scientific and historic empiricism of this age. In the biblical witness to the miraculous deeds of God they see merely myths, though probably of great aesthetic beauty, and in the church they see merely a sociological phenomenon, though probably of indispensable moral and political importance. The Evangelical and Roman Churches in Germany present today—even if not in the form of a dogmatic unity, still in practical effect and in the eyes of the world—a common front in their bearing of witness to Christ to anti-Christian and non-Christian contemporaries. This common front, though not doing away with the differences between the two churches, is still the beginning of a new fellowship and certainly it would be weakened by the creation of a dogma of the Assumption of Mary, for the results would affect both a common confession of Christ and a common contribution towards the attainment of a just political and social order.

1. Making a dogma of the Assumption of Mary could not be understood by the Evangelical Church as anything else than making a dogma out of a myth, which is indifferent to historical foundations. By raising this myth to the status of a dogma the Roman Church would place it in a series of historical redemptive acts of God which were certified to by the Apostles and on their testimony believed and proclaimed by the church uninterruptedly through the centuries. According to Roman doctrine the Assumption would have to be believed as necessary for salvation in the same degree as divine redemptive acts, such as the Incarnation, the passion, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Making the Assumption a dogma would therefore greatly aid anti-Christians and non-Christians, who deny the revelation of God in history, to reject the Christian message as a myth. This dogma would strengthen the front of the opposition in the same measure as the common front of the church would be weakened. For the Evangelical Church would then regard the Roman Church as on the side of those who make the Gospel a

myth, while the Roman Church would count the Evangelical Church among its opponents who deny the historical reality of the content of faith.

2. This question is also of importance because of its bearing on common political and social endeavors. For this cooperation is not purely a tactical matter, but presupposes a sense of the common responsibility of Christians. Inevitably this new dogma would increase the doubts of Evangelical Christians that such a common basis really does exist and does prompt to a corresponding cooperation.

Naturally a drawing closer of the Evangelical and Roman Churches also would have perils with it which might be dangerous for the members of both churches—the perils of reducing the question of truth to a matter of relativity and of eradicating differences, the perils of the enthusiasts who anticipate the unity for which we hope and pray and work before it is actually present. These perils have been apparent to both sides, even if, as we think, they have been more effectively met by the Roman than by the Evangelical Church. In any case the series of papal encyclicals “*Corporis Christi mystici*” and “*Mediator Dei*” and the “*Monitum*” just before the meeting of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948, and the “*Instructio*” of December 20, 1949 in which the ecumenical discussions were interpreted disadvantageously with reference to their bearing on conversions, have been felt as a withdrawal of the Roman See from ecumenical approaches.

The dogma of the Assumption would, to human reckoning, do away with these perils at one blow. From this point of view certain groups in the Evangelical Church would even desire and altogether welcome the dogma. The lines and the polemic against the Roman Church would then be facilitated. Our warning in the face of the proclamation of the dogma arises from a feeling of responsibility for Christendom as a whole.

As soon as one peril is avoided, another emerges, which certainly is no less pregnant than the other—the peril of self-righteousness in isolation, the peril of pride in one's spiritual possessions,

the disavowal of the work which the Spirit of God began, during the days of persecution, in the common confession and sufferings of both churches—in short a retreat to the polemical obduracy and estrangement of the past. This peril of hardening exists for both churches and would surely grow in extent and in unforeseen ways if the dogma of the Assumption of Mary is proclaimed.

May God in the present affliction of Christendom show all bodies of the ecumenical church the way that leads between both these perils, the way toward increasing appreciation of each church for the work of divine grace in the other, the way of love seeking the unity in the truth for which our Lord Jesus Christ did pray.

Contemporary Cults

As a Product of Their Environment

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

THE appearance in our day of a variety of sects and cults is not a unique phenomenon. The ancient church was disturbed by their presence. In the thirteenth century, glorified by some as the "age of faith," a contemporary reported 130 heretical sects.¹ Martin Luther denounced the "innumerable sects" of his own time and asked, "Who ever heard (to pass over the abominations of the pope) of so many monsters bursting out at once into the world as we see at this day. . . ?"² A century later Thomas Edwards described 180 different "sects, heresies, errors, blasphemies, and pernicious practices" which were then flourishing in England,³ and later Gottfried Arnold enumerated and discussed additional movements on the continent.⁴ Most of the European varieties of religion found fertile soil in America, and here they have enjoyed frequent revivals in one form or another ever since the seventeenth century. It is a remarkable fact that even the newest and most fantastic American cults are based on a rather limited number of ideas and practices which have been borrowed again and again from earlier religious movements.

Quite as remarkable, and not less important, is the fact that this limited number of ideas and practices is adapted, in every new generation, to new circumstances. Times of crisis are especially productive of new cults, and are at the same time marked

1 Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. V, Pt. 1 (New York: 1907), p. 468.

2 Preface to the large Commentary on Galatians.

3 Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena, or Catalogue and Discovery of Errors, Heresies, and Blasphemies* (London: 1646).

4 Gottfried Arnold, *Unparteyische Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*. 4 vols. Franckfurt am Main: 1700-1715.

by the revival and growth of older ones. Wars, economic depressions, and periods of intellectual ferment and social confusion have in past centuries spawned erratic religious movements. And in the first half of the present century, especially since the beginning of World War I, a swift succession of such crises has caused large numbers of people to gather around eccentric religious leaders who have promised relief from their wants and release from their fears and anxieties. Exactly how many Americans have become adherents of cults in our generation cannot be determined statistically.⁵ Some religious groups do not keep membership rolls. Others experience mushroom growth and equally swift decline. Moreover, it sometimes occurs that an individual is enrolled in several cults at the same time, or is an adherent of a cult without giving up his church membership. Estimates have placed total membership in cults as high as 17,000,000,⁶ but a third of this number would probably be more nearly correct. In any case, the number is sufficiently large to cause concern.

The particular forms which cults take in any age are largely determined by environmental conditions and by the needs which are felt by those classes of people who are attracted. I propose here to lift out three characteristics of our age and to show how some of the more radical cults of our day are related to them.

I.

One of the characteristics of the present century is an intense spirit of nationalism which is in part an inheritance from the nineteenth century and in part a product of circumstances aggravated by two world wars. The French cry for *revanche*, the Italian demand for *Italia Irredenta*, the British imperialism which was cloaked under the "white man's burden," the presumption of the superiority of German *Kultur*, and Pan-Slavism are simply some of the more familiar expressions of a pervasive nationalism.

This spirit is reflected in some of the cults which have de-

5 See, e.g., *U. S. Census, Religious Bodies, 1936*, Vol. I (Washington: 1941), p. 7.

6 Reported by Charles S. Braden in *The Christian Century*, January 12, 1944, p. 45.

veloped in our generation. Zionism, with its longing for the restoration of a Jewish national and religious center in Palestine, arose at the close of the nineteenth century. The movement received a tremendous impetus in World War I and achieved much of its goal when the state of Israel was founded after World War II. Somewhat similar was the emergence of Polish Messianism in the early part of this century. After the partitions of Poland, Polish artists, poets, and thinkers devoted their talents almost exclusively to the restoration of their country. They believed that they saw an analogy between the suffering of Poland and the suffering of Christ. Reincarnation became the basic dogma of Polish Messianism. Poland has suffered crucifixion, it was said, but it will rise again. And in returning to life, the Polish nation will become the savior of all nations.⁷ Similar once again were the German nationalistic cults which grew up around Alfred Rosenberg's *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*.⁸ Rosenberg believed that Christianity needed to be purged of Jewish influence. Jesus was of Aryan rather than of Semitic origin. St. Paul, a Pharisee to the very end of his life, was responsible for the corruption of Christianity. This corruption must be removed, asserted Rosenberg, and the original Nordic religion must be restored, with Meister Eckhardt rather than Martin Luther as the great German prophet.

In addition to these cults of Jewish, Polish, and German nationalism, there have been, and there still are, nationalistic cults which come closer home. The Liberal Church of America has adopted the constitution of the United States as its creed and has developed what it calls "Uncle Sam's religion."⁹ In developing the I Am Movement, Mr. and Mrs. Guy Ballard adopted many of the notions of the "Silver Shirts." Mr. Ballard, who called himself "the Commander-in-Chief of the United States of America,"

7 W. Caldwell, "Polish Messianism," in *Contemporary Review*, CXXXIII (April, 1928), pp. 484 ff.

8 First edition, München: 1931.

9 Cf. Elmer T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America*, revised edition (Nashville: 1949), p. 223.

claimed to be a messenger of Jesus and of a mythical St. Germain, who chose America as the location for a future heaven, called "nation of Ascended Masters." During World War II Ballard was able, he claimed, to protect the United States from danger resulting from German spies and submarines and Japanese submarines and incendiary balloons.¹⁰

Like the Mormon Kingdom of Israel, Father Divine's heavens and his Promised Land are in the United States. And like Father Divine's followers, the Christian Workers for Fellowship teach that Jesus was neither Semitic nor Aryan but a Negro, for Ezekiel described the Lord as amber in appearance "from the loins upward and from the loins downward," Daniel declared that the Lord had hair like wool, and the Psalmist said that he was like a bottle in the smoke.¹¹ Recently Father Divine announced that he had persuaded Mr. Truman to proceed with the making of a hydrogen bomb in order to protect America. "The H. Bomb is coming forth at My command, at My intuitive and inspirationic command, as I do not do anything personally, but My spirit speaketh . . . and guides the destiny of the nations of the earth."¹²

Of all nationalistic cults, however, British-Israel (called the Anglo-Saxon Federation here in America) is the most significant today. Founded in England in 1919, this movement asserts that the lost tribes of Israel, after extensive migration, found their way to the British Isles. The Anglo-Saxons in Britain and America are therefore the chosen people. Not the Jews (who were of the tribe of Judah) and not the Aryans this time, but the Anglo-Saxons! An elaborate proof is offered for this astonishing conclusion. The sons of Isaac, "Isaac-sons," are the Saxons. The word "British" is from the Hebrew *Brith*, meaning covenant, and *Ish*, meaning man—hence man of the covenant, or man with whom God made a special covenant. King George is the head of the chosen people,

10 Gerald B. Bryan, *Psychic Dictatorship in America* (Los Angeles: 1940), *passim*.

11 John Hoshor, *God in a Rolls Royce* (New York: 1936); cf. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 120, 121.

12 *The New Day*, March 4, 1950. This weekly publication carries verbatim reports of Father Divine's pronouncements. It is now published in Philadelphia, where Father Divine has his headquarters.

"a holy people," a "race of super-men." The Church of England reflects the true worship of the chosen people, and it may therefore not be surprising that the Anglo-Saxon Federation counts "among its members and supporters . . . bishops, clergy, and lay-preachers of the Anglican Church" together with many members of the "nobility" in England and America.¹³ Here we can see most clearly how nationalism has been embodied in our day in a religious cult.

II.

A second characteristic of our age is a universal awareness of grave problems which confront the world. Never before in history have men and women been so well informed about impending dangers, and seldom have the dangers been so great. It is not at all surprising that under these circumstances the average man should feel incapable of understanding the troubled world in which he is living. His difficulty is vastly increased by the breakdown of traditional standards of morality and by uncertainty concerning deeper norms of goodness. Tossed about without anchorage on a sea of political, economic, social, and intellectual ferment, many a man and woman in our day is harassed by anxieties and fears. Many a disillusioned man and woman is eager to reach out for any teaching which promises to restore meaning to life and offer an explanation for what is happening in the world. And the cults which meet such needs have enjoyed a phenomenal growth.

On the one hand, there are cults whose interpretation of our times is pessimistic. Notable among these is the cult of the Jehovah's Witnesses. We are in the last times, Judge Rutherford declared. Bible prophecy indicates that on August 1, 1914, the very time when World War I began, the Lord began, "in his own majestic way," to "destroy the evil things of this world to make

13 Special supplement to *The National Message*, February, 1931, published in Haverhill, Mass. *The White Eagle—its Symbolism*, a pamphlet, n. d. For an outsider's description see Charles S. Braden, *These Also Believe* (New York: 1949), pp. 385-402.

way for the establishment of his kingdom of righteousness." Since August 1, 1914, other prophecies have been in process of fulfillment. After World War I, in which nation rose against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, "there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places." The Jehovah's Witnesses point out that World War I was in fact followed by famines, by "the great pestilence of the influenza," by uncommon earthquakes, and by revolutions which are symbolized by earthquakes. As further evidences of the passing away of the old order the Jehovah's Witnesses refer to "the labor troubles, strikes, lock-outs, profiteering, Bolshevism, and anarchy" of the 1920's.¹⁴ The League of Nations, which proposed to establish world peace despite the Biblical prophecy that wars will not cease, was fathered by Satan and is "Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth."¹⁵ World War II occurred, too, according to prophecy, and the United Nations, established in 1945, "came forth from the abyss . . . with a few alterations of face and structure, but it embodies the same ideas as the former League" and is therefore Satanic.¹⁶ In this fashion the Jehovah's Witnesses interpret the events of our generation. The times are evil. The end is approaching. It is necessary to flee from evil society and prepare for the establishment of God's kingdom on this earth. This will be accomplished, not by man, but by a cataclysmic act of God.

Other cults offer a more optimistic interpretation of our times. God created the universe and his power remains active in it. Accordingly there cannot be anything intrinsically bad in this world. Injustice, suffering, death—these are all illusions. This is the teaching of New Thought and of Christian Science, older cults which experienced their greatest growth since the turn of the century. "Evil," wrote Mary Baker Eddy, "is a negation, because it is the absence of truth. It is nothing, because it is the absence of something. It is unreal, because it presupposes the absence of

14 *World Distress* (Brooklyn: Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society, 1924), pamphlet.

15 J. F. Rutherford, *Light* (Brooklyn: 1930), Vol. II, *passim*.

16 *The Commander to the Peoples* (Brooklyn: 1945), pp. 27-29.

God.”¹⁷ So, for example, there is no such thing as pain except as we think there is. “You say a boil is painful; but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests, through inflammation and swelling, a belief in pain, and this belief is called a boil.”¹⁸ A man testified in a Christian Science church that after smoking for thirty years he had decided to quit the habit. He believed that the habit was real and therefore did not succeed in overcoming it. “One day the light broke upon his thought that, since as the child of God he had never smoked, he did not have to be healed of something which in the reality of his being he had never done. The healing was instantaneous.”¹⁹

The fundamental idea in Christian Science has been applied to larger problems by Frank B. Robinson, who founded the cult called Psychiana in 1929. He instructs his followers to relax, close their eyes, and then repeat slowly, “I believe in the power of the living God.” After long practice this affirmation can be followed by another: “I am finding the power of the living God.” Adherents of Psychiana may in time affirm whatever they wish—health, wealth, happiness, success—and be sure of gaining it. When enough Americans realize that “the power of the spirit of God is available” to all, Robinson asserts, “this world will change completely. Wars will cease, illness and death will be no more, for the life-giving power of the spirit of God is more powerful than the phenomenon we call death. There will be no more tears, no more sorrow, no more suspicion of the other fellow, no more crime, no more immorality, no more whiskey and brothels, no more . . . church members, for the sham of the present day religion will be cast off, and in its place will come the power of Almighty God.”²⁰ Psychiana shares with the Jehovah’s Witnesses a profound hostility to Christian churches, but its interpretation of the world and society is quite different.

17 Mary Baker Eddy, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* (Boston: 1912), p. 186.

18 *Op. cit.*, p. 153.

19 Anon., *Today’s Demands* (Boston: Christian Science Publishing Society, 1937), pp. 17, 18. For many similar testimonies see *The Christian Science Journal*, published in Boston since 1883.

20 Quoted by Charles S. Braden, *These Also Believe*, p. 105.

III.

A third characteristic of our age is concern with the material things of this life. This concern has been stimulated by advertising, it was intensified by the economic depression which began in 1929, it has been nurtured since 1939 by high wages. Most Americans are less interested in heavenly mansions than they are in housing projects here on earth. They prefer to eat three square meals here than sip ambrosia in the New Jerusalem. And a number of religious cults have emerged and have flourished because they have satisfied the widespread desire for prosperity and success.

"If you are in trouble," the *Crusaders' Sentinel* declares,²¹ "write at once to the Masters [of the Crusaders Order of the World]. . . . No matter what your problem or difficulty may be, a solution can be found for it, and proper direction can be given you by those who understand it. Troubles and difficulties in the home, in social life, in business; problems of health, concerning your work—all these things can be studied and you can have the benefit of these Masters' expert opinions by simply writing to us and stating your situation. . . . Don't begin new things all alone; don't allow yourself to be confused. . . ." In like fashion the Rosicrucians offer to reveal any applicant's "cosmic abilities and powers," and will tell him what he can do to make a real success of his life and "achieve fame, fortune, happiness, and power." The application blank for enrollment in Psychiana promises "health, wealth, and happiness."

Even more influential is Unity, founded at the turn of the century by Charles Fillmore and his wife Myrtle, who had previously been Christian Scientists. God, declares Unity, dwells in man and is therefore always accessible. All that man needs is abundantly supplied by God. But man must know how to tap the divine source of wealth. For this purpose affirmations are recommended: "The all-providing Mind is my resource, and I am secure

21 *The Crusaders' Sentinel*, February, 1940. This organ of the Crusaders Order of the World describes itself as "a publication dealing with spiritual, psychological, and metaphysical questions devoted to the revelation and the understanding of truth."

in my prosperity," or "Divine love bountifully supplies and increases substance to meet my every need." The great emphasis which he places on the availability to man of God's abundance is illustrated in Fillmore's paraphrase of Psalm 23:

The Lord is my banker ; my credit is good.
 He maketh me to lie down in the consciousness of omnipresent abundance ;
 He giveth me the key to his strong-box,
 He restoreth my faith in his riches,
 He guideth me in the paths of prosperity for his name's sake.
 Yet though I walk through the very shadow of debt
 I shall fear no evil, for Thou art with me ;
 Thy silver and gold, they secure me.
 Thou preparest a way for me in the presence of the collector ;
 Thou fillest my wallet with plenty ; my measure runneth over.
 Surely goodness and plenty will follow me all the days of my life,
 And I shall do business in the name of the Lord forever.²²

Of all the contemporary cults which promise material benefits, the Peace Mission Movement of Father Divine offers the most instructive example, for it owes its success in a very real sense to the economic depression during which it enjoyed its greatest increment. Moreover, its appeal was addressed especially to urban Negroes who felt the effects of the depression most severely. The founder of the cult, Father Divine, called himself a "tangibilization of God." "I can see the gods of men failing," he declared. "The mighty dollar has failed them. Mighty men have failed them. Can you not see politics failing? Can you not see sociality failing them? Can you not see all of these divers expressions and versions of men which they set up on which to lean, they all are failing them?"²³ It seemed, indeed, as if there were no help for the underprivileged Negro. But Father Divine had come to be their savior. "I have come to give you victory over difficulties, over races, over creeds and colors, over segregation, over prejudices. . . . I came to bring deliverance . . . to those who are the most needy. My Con-

²² Quoted in Braden, *op. cit.*, pp. 171, 172.

²³ *The New Day*, September 1, 1938, p. 18.

descension to the Earth plane was to come in the likeness of them.” “As the Emancipator of humanity from depressions, suppressions, oppressions, and from all oppressors of undesirable conditions, I came.”²⁴ And so it seemed to the throngs who crowded around him. Those who lived in harmony with him would no longer know sickness or death. The barriers between races would be broken down. His followers would suffer no physical want, for he would furnish them with food, shelter, and clothing. “This is My Mission,” he said. “This is what I AM doing: I AM bringing all mankind back to the Garden of Eden.”²⁵

This was not altogether empty talk. By means of a system of cooperatives, called “heavens,” he actually did supply the physical needs of thousands. By means of cajolery or threats of boycott he secured work for the unemployed. His converts were persuaded to live moral and useful lives. And in the meantime Father Divine knew how to dramatize himself and his claims to power in the face of opponents, as he did recently when he told his followers in Harlem, the Negro section of New York City: “I will carry out MY PLAN and PURPOSE with or without a BODY. If I did not have a BODY, I would carry it out just the same, for I AM SPIRIT, yet SPIRIT PERSONIFIED! . . . If you do not love me and keep my commandments, I will curse your going out and I will curse your coming in and I will curse you in your storehouses and in your baskets! I said I will dry up your rivers and I will dry up your streams! This water shortage in New York City has been just a slight sketch and a reflection of what I will do! I will do it with or without a BODY! Aren’t you glad? . . . Whatsoever I will must be, and what I command, it must be done!”²⁶

But in the final analysis the reason for Father Divine’s appeal lies in the fact that he has made God real to his followers. His heavens are here on earth, not in some remote place in the sky. The God he talks about is not “decillions and decillions of miles

24 Hoshor, *op. cit.*, pp. 112, 113, 114.

25 *The New Day*, September 1, 1938, p. 19.

26 *The New Day*, January 14, 1950, pp. 4, 5.

away," but here and now, "materialized and tangibilated" in Father Divine's own body. "People have been talking about God for many years," one of his followers said, "but today a God whom you can't see or never have any personal contact with just doesn't fill the bill. A promise of some home far beyond the clouds, with milk and honey flowing freely, really isn't what it takes to keep going down here on terra firma. If God can't take care of me here and now, then how can I know or even believe that He'll do so very much after I'm dead and gone. . . . And then to think He's made Harlem his home and receives his mail only a few doors up the street. It's truly wonderful."²⁷ For the followers of Father Divine, God is near and real, an ever present help, the supplier of every material need.

IV.

I have now singled out three characteristics of our age and have attempted to show how contemporary cults are related to them. Some cults are nationalistic, some cults offer plausible interpretations of our troubled world, some cults promise material benefits in a heaven on earth. There are several things, however, which all the cults have in common.

1. The cults are unanimous in their rejection of the churches. They are conscious competitors of the churches. They owe their origin or their growth to specific dissatisfaction with the churches. And the opposition which they have encountered from the churches has naturally produced counter-attacks. The consequent criticism runs the gamut from tolerant scorn of the churches to bitter condemnation. Spiritualists subtly explain that when orthodox Christians die and their spirits enter the spirit world, they are permitted to cling for a while to their erroneous beliefs, but gradually even the most rigid Baptist, Lutheran, or Roman Catholic becomes aware of the fact that there is no heaven, no hell, no purgatory, no communion with Jesus, and that what the churches taught here

²⁷ *The Spoken Word*, August 18, 1936, p. 21. *The Spoken Word* was a forerunner of *The New Day*.

on earth is wrong.²⁸ The Ballards, founders of the cult of the I Am, urge their followers: "Forget everything else you have ever studied."²⁹ The Jehovah's Witnesses charge that "anyone who really loves God . . . must of necessity be an uncompromising foe of 'organized Christianity,' which is in fact a part of the Devil's organization."³⁰

2. This criticism of the churches is generally incarnated in a prophet who completely dominates his cult. In some cases the cult leader remains in the background, as Frank Buchman has done.³¹ More often the cult leader exercises his influence directly through the force of his personality, the strength of his convictions, and his claim to unique religious experience. Such leaders were Joseph Smith, Jr., the "prophet, seer, and revelator" of the Mormons, and Aimee Semple McPherson, founder of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel. Noteworthy in this connection is the appearance of an increasing number of female prophets, of whom Ann Lee, of the Shakers, and Mary Baker Eddy were forerunners. Even after their death such cult leaders usually continue to control their followers.

3. Such control of adherents is possible because each cult leader claims to be the bearer of a new revelation. This is true even in the case of cults which, like Jehovah's Witnesses, make much of the Bible, for their voluminous official interpretations of the Bible have the effect of supplanting it.³² Prophecies are found in the Bible of such modern inventions as trains, the telegraph, airplanes, and tanks.³³ The use of Christmas trees is condemned on the basis of Jeremiah 10:2-4: "Learn not the way of the nations. . . . The customs of the people are variety; for one cutteth a tree out of the forest. . . . They deck it with silver and with gold."

28 George Lawton, *The Drama of Life after Death. A Study of the Spiritualist Religion* (New York: 1932), pp. 65, 66.

29 Bryan, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

30 J. F. Rutherford, *Preservation* (Brooklyn: 1932), p. 72 and often elsewhere.

31 Allan W. Eister, *Drawing-Room Conversion: a Sociological Account of the Oxford Group Movement* (Durham, N. C.: 1950), pp. 106-112.

32 Herbert H. Stroup, *The Jehovah's Witnesses* (New York: 1945), p. 47.

33 *World Distress* (Brooklyn: 1924), p. 21. Cf. Harold Preece and Celia Kraft, *Dew on Jordan* (New York: 1946), p. 176.

Significant is the preference of the cults for the Old Testament (notably in the case of the Mormons and the Jehovah's Witnesses), which suggests the Calvinistic soil out of which they came and in which they grew. But in addition to inspired interpretations of the Scriptures, cult leaders have produced new Bibles: The Book of Mormon, Oahspe, the I Am messages from the Ascended Masters, the messages which Spiritualist mediums get from the spirit world, the extemporaneous addresses of Father Divine which are taken down in shorthand and published weekly in *The New Day*. Some of these are "systematized ignorance." Immanuel Kant called Swedenborg's *Arcana Coelestia* "eight quarto folios of pure nonsense," and critics have observed that some sentences in Mary Baker Eddy's *Science and Health* are as meaningful when read backwards as forwards. But this does not alter the fact that these writings are received as divine revelation.

4. The morality set forth in special revelations and enjoined on cult members is quite uniformly Puritanical. The use of alcoholic beverages is forbidden to all from Theosophists and Christian Scientists to the Jehovah's Witnesses and the adherents of I Am. With few exceptions cultists are denied the use of tobacco. Many are vegetarians, and Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses observe the dietary laws of the Jews. I Am-ers also abstain from eating garlic and onions. Except in the case of the Mormons, sex is taboo, marriage is discouraged, and in some instances all "sex-intercourse," as Father Divine calls it, is strictly forbidden under all circumstances. Theater attendance and "worldly amusements" are frowned upon. Often regulations are adopted to prescribe plain and discreet dress. And according to the Spiritualists, even spirits in the spirit world are clothed, although neither climate nor sex would require covering. Here is interesting evidence of the American (and Puritanical) origin of this cult.

5. The teaching of the cults is egocentric. To be sure, God always plays a part. But man, man's needs, man's desires, man's problems occupy the center of the stage. God exists for the most part as a backdrop, as an ultimate supplier of man's needs, as an ultimate fulfiller of man's ambitions, as an ultimate answer to

man's problems. In the foreground, as a rule, is a special technique for securing God's favor or help. For the Spiritualists this is communication with the spirit world through mediums. For Christian Scientists and others this is a denial of matter and sickness, a psychological device for convincing oneself that all is well. Nowhere is there a real apprehension of the Christian doctrines of sin and grace.

The Doctrine of the Real Presence

REGIN PRENTER

I DO NOT intend in this article to expound the traditional Lutheran doctrine of the real presence at any length—neither the doctrine of Luther himself nor that of Lutheran orthodoxy. What I shall try to do in this paper is to define some of the problems—not all—which the doctrine of the real presence raises in our present theological thinking in the Lutheran community.

I find the main problem of the doctrine of the real presence in the understanding of the specific character of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. How can the real presence in the Eucharist be distinguished from the presence of the risen Christ in his church in general? The resurrection and ascension mean that Christ is everywhere present in His church, not only in the Eucharist. The resurrection and the ascension do not mean the final disappearance of the human Christ from this earth. They only mean a change in the mode of His presence. The resurrection and the ascension signify that the Incarnate Word, the man Jesus Christ, is now present in His church in that specific manner, in which He alone can be present in the interval between his death on the cross and his second coming in glory. This presence of the risen and ascended Christ is a presence to faith alone, or to express it in other words, it is a presence in the Holy Spirit, a *spiritual* presence. By the word spiritual we express the idea that Christ is present in a manner which is hidden to all knowledge of the flesh, i.e., to all knowledge of man in his separation from God and in his opposition to God. That does not mean that the risen Christ is not present with fleshly man. He certainly is. The resurrection of Christ means that His glorified humanity now shares in the omnipresence of God the Father, the Creator of heaven and earth. The risen Christ is present with everybody. But the spiritual presence indicates that His

presence is hidden to all to whom the Spirit of God does not reveal it. The presence of the risen and ascended Christ in the time between His death and His second coming is only discernible to faith, to which it has been revealed by the Holy Spirit.

The Spirit reveals to faith the reality of the risen Christ through the word, spoken by His witnesses. Where Christ is present in the Holy Spirit, as the risen Lord, a word is always spoken, to which faith clings. The spirit is ministered to us by the hearing of faith, St. Paul asserts in Galatians 3:2,5.

The presence of Jesus Christ in His church between the ascension and the second advent thus is a spiritual presence, and this involves that His presence is made known to faith only by the word, the witness of living men to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Spiritual presence thus distinguishes itself from any kind of natural presence. The presence of natural objects is always discernible to human sensation and reason. That which is present in the natural manner may be perceived by sensation or may be deduced from its effects by reason. In this sense all natural objects are "visible," i.e., they are discernible through some human act of perception. Spiritual presence is no natural presence. The risen Christ is not present in such a manner that he may be perceived by human faculties of knowledge. His presence is not "visible." The spiritual presence is invisible. Faith which alone perceives the spiritual presence is according to its nature the evidence of things not seen (Hebrews 11:1). The presence of the spiritual reality is not perceived by human sensation or rational deduction, but apprehended by that faith which listens to the witness of the Gospel. The Gospel proclaims the resurrection of Jesus Christ; faith, moved by the power of the Holy Spirit, believes this proclamation to be true, and so apprehends the reality of His invisible presence.

It is true therefore to say that the spiritual presence is essentially a presence in and through the spoken word of the Gospel. We here distinguish spiritual presence from omnipresence. The gospel of the resurrection of Jesus Christ asserts that "He is no longer poor and miserable on earth," as it is expressed in the col-

lect for Ascension Day in the Danish Prayerbook. He has been exalted to the right hand of God the Father and shares His divine omnipresence. Thus Jesus Christ, as I said before, is present with every man. But He is not *spiritually* present with every man. Spiritually He is only present to faith. Spiritual presence is always a presence to faith through the spoken word of the Gospel. We therefore declare that there can be no spiritual presence except where the Gospel is being proclaimed.

This observation is of the greatest importance to the understanding of the nature of a sacrament. We are speaking of a spiritual presence of Christ especially in the Sacraments. If this spiritual presence is essentially a presence in and through the spoken word of the Gospel, it obviously follows that there is no sacramental presence where the Gospel is not proclaimed. Sacrament and preaching belong together. Faith, which alone perceives the reality of the spiritual presence, cannot exist without listening to the Gospel. Faith as the evidence of things not seen is always a faith which consists in hearing the Gospel, a *fides ex auditu*. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Romans 10:17). Preaching of the Gospel and the Sacraments belong together and cannot be separated. In some of his early writings on the Sacraments Luther expressed this correlation of word and sacrament by making the Gospel itself a part of the Sacrament. Instead of the scholastic conception of the Sacrament as consisting of form (the word of consecration) and matter (the mere ritual act) Luther taught that a sacrament consists of the word of promise and the sign. The idea of the word of promise which has taken the place of the idea of the form of the Sacrament signifies nothing but the Gospel itself. The sign which is attached to the promise is the confirmation of the promise, the declaration that this promise is now being fulfilled, that the promised Christ is now really present.

If we admit that the spiritual presence is always a presence in and through the word of the Gospel we, however, do not pretend that the spiritual presence is the presence of the Gospel. On the contrary, when the Gospel is present, when it is being preached,

it points to the spiritually present Christ as a reality beyond itself. This is very important. If we do not distinguish between the word of the Gospel and the presence of the living Christ we shall never be able to understand the meaning of sacraments or the relation between word and sacrament. It is true that the word of the Gospel is not only a story about Christ. It is a word from Christ, a word which he himself is actually speaking. But in order to speak the Gospel Christ must exist, he must live. His own spiritual presence to which the Gospel points is the necessary condition to the presence of the Gospel as His own living word. In modern theology it is sometime maintained, e.g., by Rudolf Bultmann, that the only reality of the resurrection is the reality of the Gospel. The proclamation of the word of the cross is the resurrection, the Gospel word is the risen Christ.

This is not what the New Testament understands by resurrection. The Gospel, which is preached, does not claim to be Christ itself, it only is His word and thus points to the living Christ beyond itself. The spiritual presence is the presence of Christ in and through the Gospel. It is not the presence of the gospel itself without a living Christ beyond it.

But now the problem of the spiritual presence has become quite acute. What does it mean, then, that Christ is present, when on one hand He is only present in and through the word of the Gospel, and on the other hand He is not Himself merely the word. What then is the reality of His presence?

I do not think that we can answer this question without speaking of the Sacraments in their distinction from the word of the Gospel. The idea of the sign, connected to the word of promise in the Sacrament, now becomes important.

Why has the sign been added, in the Sacraments, to the word of promise? I said before that the function of the sign was to confirm or declare that the promise is now being fulfilled. In order to see what this means, we must once more return to the word of promise, to the Gospel itself. The content of the Gospel is the history of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. That at least is an abbreviated way of expressing it. Because of the record

of the election and guidance of the old Israel and the redemption of Israel in Jesus Christ and its transformation into the new Israel on earth, the church of Jesus Christ also belong to that history. It is the history of God's redeeming work from the beginning to the end. The word telling this history is the Gospel. Now, the form of the Gospel was characterized as *promise*. The telling of the history of God's redeeming works always means the pronouncing of a *promise*. Why so?

It is so because the history which the Gospel relates, is the history of God's *redeeming* work. The word of the Gospel is spoken to people who are in need of redemption, who are *waiting* for redemption. The word of the Gospel proclaims to these people that God has now accomplished the decisive act of their redemption in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. All this was done for *our* salvation. It was all done for us. He assumed *our* humanity, he carried *our* sins, he overcame *our* death. Therefore the Gospel is a promise *to us*. It says: Lift up your heads. For your redemption draweth near (Luke 21:28). But it is a promise, it is not the consummation. Although God already in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, accomplished the decisive act of redemption, there is still something to be expected. The act of redemption has been accomplished in Him, in Jesus Christ. The Gospel promises us the redemption which *has been* accomplished in Him. Faith clings to that promise. Faith therefore already owns the redemption. We are saved by hope (Romans 8:24). But saying so, faith acknowledges what is still lacking: the redemption which has been accomplished in Him, must be consummated *in us*.

That is to say, we must be made like unto Him, be transformed into His image. We must be sanctified in ourselves just as we are justified in Him. This sanctification or transformation shall not be fully accomplished until our resurrection from the dead. But it has its beginning in the same instant in which the promise of the Gospel has been pronounced unto us and perceived by us in faith. This transformation takes the form of a constant struggle between the new man in us, who is faith clinging to the promise of redemption in Jesus Christ, and the old man in us, who is the

sinful and fleshly nature resisting God's work. As long as we live on this earth this struggle will go on. The old man, sin and flesh, shall not be totally overcome before our death and resurrection. As long as we live on this earth we are *righteous and sinful at the same time. Simul justi et peccatores*. We are righteous in God's promise and through faith which clings to that promise. We are sinful in our own state of imperfection because of the remaining sin and resistance, which has still to be overcome. As long as we are living in this state of contradiction or struggle God must deal with us in a double manner. First, He must promise unto us our redemption, accomplished in Jesus Christ in order that faith may cling to that promise and thus a new righteous man be born in us. Second, He must fight against all that in us which resists His promise, our unrighteousness, and more and more drive it out, until in our death and resurrection from the dead it shall be finally and decisively destroyed. The first work, our justification, He is doing through the preaching of the Gospel. This first work, therefore, is revealed unto faith. The second work, our sanctification, He is doing through His secret operation, which He is accomplishing in His continuous act of creation.

This secret operation is not visible to us, not even to our faith. What is visible is the sign, which God has given us as the confirmation of His revealed promise and of His secret working towards the final fulfillment of that promise; that is to say, the sign of *Baptism* and of the *Eucharist*. These signs are not only symbols or illustrations of God's sanctifying action. They indicate that God is really present working toward the final goal of His redemptive work in us, our death and resurrection. In this sense we may call them *instruments* of His sanctifying operation, not only symbols of it. But we must not regard them as supernatural instruments effecting some mystical psychological change in us. God's sanctifying operation in us is not a supernatural causation which God from above inserts into the system of natural causes and effects. If that were the case we would be able to trace these supernatural causes through their effects, after their insertion into the system of natural causation. The operation of God would then not be totally

hidden. Only its origin would be mysterious. God uses for His purpose natural causes. The redeemer is the creator and He need not use causes which do not belong to His own created world, where He has placed us, and just for this reason His sanctifying work remains hidden. When we call Baptism and the Eucharist instruments of God's sanctifying work in us, we think of them as eschatological instruments. That is: we believe that where these signs are, God is working on our sanctification without interruption until He finishes His work in our death and the resurrection of our body. Baptism is an eschatological instrument of God's sanctifying work, because it is the *real* and *effective* beginning of our new creation, which shall be accomplished in our death and resurrection. The Holy Eucharist is an eschatological instrument of God's sanctifying work, because it is the *real* and *effective* beginning of our eternal life in the world to come. As eschatological instruments the signs of Baptism and Eucharist are visible indications of an operation of God, which remains invisible; that is to say, it is only to be perceived by faith which clings to the word of promise, pronounced in the Gospel. Faith perceives behind the visible sign the reality of God's invisible sanctifying operation, which remains invisible until in the resurrection and the life everlasting it becomes an outward and visible fact.

Now we see in which sense the real presence of Christ Himself must be distinguished from the presence of the Gospel. It is true that Christ is only spiritually present in and through the Gospel. Without the Gospel and faith clinging to the Gospel there can be no spiritual presence. But faith clinging to the Gospel perceives the spiritual presence of the living Christ in and through the Gospel as something distinct from the Gospel itself. Faith perceives the presence of the living Christ as an invisible working towards the final consummation of the work promised, hidden behind the visible signs of the Sacraments. Faith perceives Christ present in and through the word not only as the author of the word of promise, but at the same time as the constantly active fulfiller of that promise. *That* is the real presence. A presence which is at the same time the presence of a revealed promise, granting the full

salvation at once to hoping man, and the presence of a hidden operation, which effects gradually, from day to day, until the day of the resurrection, the sanctification of struggling man, His transforming into the image of Christ.

In this sense, however, Christ is present both in the preaching of the Gospel and in Baptism and in Holy Eucharist. But we are accustomed to speak of the presence as something which is specifically associated with the Holy Eucharist. Perhaps we ought to speak of His spiritual presence in preaching and Baptism, without adding the predication *real*, so that the word *real* would be used only of that specific mode of spiritual presence which is associated with the Holy Eucharist.

So we finally ask: is there a proper mode of spiritual presence associated with the Holy Eucharist which explains why we designate the Eucharistic presence as *real* presence in a sense which we would not employ in speaking of Baptism or the preaching of the Gospel?

We cannot answer this question without turning to the institution of the Sacrament. Baptism was instituted as the sacrament of the new birth. Behind the sign of Baptism, pointing to our real death and resurrection, faith discerns Christ's secret operation, which is the real and effective beginning of our death and resurrection with Christ, the final annihilation of sin and flesh and the birth of a totally new man in Christ. Behind the sign of the Eucharist, pointing to our everlasting life in the kingdom of God, faith discerns Christ's secret operation, which is the real and effective beginning of our permanent fellowship with Him in the world to come. The sign of the Eucharist is *a meal*; it is not, like the sign of Baptism, a *death*. The sign of Baptism is not repeated, because our death and resurrection are not repeated; it is the unrepeatable act of transition from this world to the coming world. The sign of the Eucharist is constantly repeated because the nourishment unto life in the world to come shall never cease.

In the meal to be repeated forever there is a specific mode of presence, which perhaps may be signified by the word "real," if we take the word in a strict sense. Real, *realis*, means something

like a property, a *res*, something which we can make our own possession. In this way Christ is present in the Eucharist, because He is present in the meal not only as the giver of the meal, the host presiding at the meal, but as the substance of the meal. We cannot understand this without recurring to the thought of the Eucharist as a sacrificial meal, which Christ expressed through the words "blood of the Covenant," or, "the New Covenant in my blood." By these words he signifies that an essential relationship exists between His sacrificial death on the cross and the meal of His church. This meal cannot be repeated after His death except on the basis of His death as the sacrifice of the New Covenant, corresponding to the sacrifice of the Old Covenant mentioned in Exodus 24. Therefore He says that the substance of the meal—as in every sacrificial meal—is identical with the gift offered unto God, in order that the partaking of the meal may grant full communion with God. In the meal, which He himself shares with His church, his people, He gives Himself to His people as food. The only way of living *with* Him forever is to live *by* Him. He was in that sense of the word the substance of the meal, He was the *bread of life* to His followers, already at the meals which He had with His disciples during His earthly life. He was the bread and the wine, as the Fourth Gospel says. But in order that He might become the bread of all men for ever He had to die as a sacrifice for the whole world. Therefore the bread of life has become the body which was offered for us, the cup of joy has become the blood which was shed for us.

The sign of the Eucharist therefore indicates a specific manner of God's sanctifying operation. In Baptism He is present invisibly working our death and resurrection. In the Eucharist He is present as the secret nourisher of our eternal life. His presence is in both cases real in the wider sense of the word. But in the Eucharist His presence is real in the specific sense of the word "real." He is present not only *with* us, working on us, as He is in Baptism, but He is present *in* us, as our nourishment unto eternal life.

Why, then, has He chosen those two signs, water and bread,

as eschatological instruments of His sanctifying operation in us? This is our final question. Why could He not work on us and live in us without any external sign or through quite different signs?

I know no way of answering that question than to point to the correlation of creation and redemption. The redemption of mankind in Jesus Christ is not the elevation of man to a higher supernatural state of being than that to which He has been created. Redemption is the restoration of the fallen creation. It is the deliverance of man, created in the image of God, from all the evil powers which keep him in prison. Through redemption man does not become superman, he becomes man, just as the Word of God became man when He was born in Bethlehem, not only when He was raised from the dead. The resurrection of the body therefore is the beginning of the true human life, unto which man originally was created. Therefore God works our sanctification through instruments which belong to the original creation. We are born to the redeemed life through *real water*. We are nourished unto the redeemed life through *real bread and wine*. This signifies that the redeemed life in its consummation in the world to come is a real human life, not a different life from the life which we live here on this earth, but this our very earthly life redeemed and restored. And therefore the sanctification of the water in Holy Baptism is not only the sanctification of the sacramental element, but it is the sanctification of our own grave in the cemetery. Thus our grave has become a holy place since our Baptism; all steps in our life, along its many roads leading toward that grave, have become a holy pilgrimage. There is no separation possible any longer between a profane and a holy sphere of life. The world of our creation has since our baptism become holy, redeemed from the unjust tyranny of the devil and all his powers. We need no longer withdraw from it. We may go into it. It is everywhere a holy and sanctified world, not only in church, but in our home, in our workshop, in our streets and places of recreation. And so the sanctification of bread and wine in the Eucharist is not only the sanctification of the elements of a sacramental meal, but the sanctification of all our daily bread and of the work through which we earn it.

The real presence of Christ behind this sign does not alter the connection between its elements and the ordinary bread and wine.

In the early church, when the Fathers had to fight against gnostic tendencies to deny the reality of the creation and to separate creation and redemption, this connection between the sacramental signs and the ordinary elements of our human life was never forgotten. Later it was forgotten. The doctrine of transubstantiation is the proof that it has been forgotten. Where the bread is no longer real, earthly bread, where it has been changed in its substance, although not in its accidentals, the relation between redemption and creation in the Sacraments has been obscured, and our daily life falls outside our religious life as a profane or secularized existence, from which we must escape if we would be holy. But a "sanctification" which consists in separation from our natural, daily life, our life in God's creation, is really no sanctification, but an apostasy.

In our doctrine of the real presence we, therefore, reject the doctrine of transubstantiation. When living in us, Christ identifies Himself not with a transformed bread, but with the ordinary bread of our daily life, which is His own creation, in order thereby to show us that the eternal life which He gives us is a real human life, and in order thereby to sanctify our ordinary human bread, all our common meals which He in His mercy gives us to eat in this, his own, wonderful world.

A Lutheran Singapore

HAROLD FLOREEN

NEVER was the Apostle Paul more vehement than when he resisted the legalistic demands of the Judaizers. He knew that any intrusion of works, even as a partial basis for justification before God, would immediately set aside justification by faith and bring the Law back again. Nor was this a mere academic matter with Paul. Many souls had found new life through the "glad tidings" that, in pure grace, God receives and reckons to be righteous all who believe in Christ. Was he to idly permit the destruction of these souls through the infiltration of legalism?

The same vehemence characterized Luther in his opposition to work righteousness. He, too, was concerned that men should not be robbed of God's grace by the cunning efforts of false teachers to bring the Law back into the picture.

The Lutheran Church has likewise sought to proclaim and to uphold the doctrine of justification by faith. Again, this has not been mere academic interest on our part. To compromise this doctrine would be to deny our Lord and to forfeit our opportunity to minister to souls with a saving Gospel. It is not surprising, therefore, that this doctrine is of strategic importance to us and one which we must hold against all attacks. It is a "Singapore" which we cannot afford to surrender.

That there is zeal in our midst to uphold justification by faith against all attacks is not to be denied. The British, too, were zealous to defend Singapore. They lost the stronghold because they had anticipated attacks only from the seaward side and had placed all their defenses there. Apparently, it had not occurred to them that an enemy would reach Singapore through British Malaya. Similarly, our stronghold of justification by faith can be lost to us if we fail to recognize that work righteousness is not the only

attack that can undermine our position. The purpose of this study is to indicate a particularly weak side in our stand, as American Lutherans, on justification by faith.

In his discussion of the doctrine of justification by faith in Romans and Galatians, Paul not only ruled out the works of the Law but also attacked any tendency to regard differences between people, except in the matter of faith. In justification by grace alone through faith alone, nothing whatever might be ranged along with God-given faith as a determining factor. Hence, all differences between people fall away, as so clearly indicated in the keynote to Romans: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to *every one* that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (*italics ours*) Romans 1:16.

Again, in the third chapter of Romans, Paul asserts that there is no distinction between men "for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus . . ." Romans 3:23, 24. All alike are guilty before God, and all must be saved by grace alone through faith alone. The same implication of justification by faith appears in Galatians:

For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus. Galatians 3:26-28.

Thus, it is obvious from these writings of Paul that to regard differences between people as being either meritorious or condemning in the matter of justification is as contrary to the Gospel of Christ as to make "good works" a basis for righteousness before God. To feel that somehow we are more acceptable to God because we belong to the Lutheran church, or come from a Christian home, or have a particular national background, or belong to the Caucasian race, is admittedly as disastrous a form of legalism as to hold to a work righteousness. However, the temptation to regard distinctions between people also comes to us in a far more subtle way. We might not depend at all upon such

differences when considering the matter of our own justification, but, through expediency, we might permit differences to enter into our policy of evangelism without realizing that we are thereby denying justification by faith. We are called to proclaim the glorious truth that God justifies without respect of persons all who believe in Christ. Hence, if our proclamation is to be in harmony with our message, we cannot consistently withhold the news of that justification from any single person because of his peculiar individual characteristics. When the Apostle Peter was convinced by a vision and by a bestowal of the Holy Spirit "that God is no respecter of persons," he regarded it as withstanding God to withhold the Word and Baptism from the Gentiles to whom he had been sent (Acts 10, 11).

Nor would Paul have been consistent in his belief that differences between people are ruled out in justification by faith if he had been selective in his ministry. Hence, it is extremely significant that, even before his doctrinal discussion in Romans, we find a clear statement of his practical missionary policy:

And I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (and was hindered hitherto), that I might have some fruit in you also, even as in the rest of the Gentiles. I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you also that are in Rome. Romans 1:13-15.

Evidence of the consistency with which Paul carried out a universal ministry is found also in his farewell message to the Ephesian elders: ". . . I shrank not from declaring unto you anything that was profitable, and teaching you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to Jews and to Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20:20, 21. Particular notice, however, should be taken of this declaration: "Wherefore I testify unto you this day, that I am pure from the blood of *all men*. For I shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God" (*italics ours*) Acts 20:26, 27.

Luther also acknowledged the practical implications of justi-

fication by faith. No ministry was more inclusive than his, for he sought to minister with the Gospel, without distinction, to rich and poor, peasant and noble, ignorant and learned, Jew and Gentile. He sharply denounced any claim to superiority by priest or monk, teaching rather the "priesthood of all believers."

One could hardly say that the Lutheran Church in America has shown the vision which characterized either Paul or Luther in connection with differences between people. To be sure, there is an awareness that our ministry, all too generally, has tended to be selective in character. Nationalistic barriers have been breaking down rapidly, but we are only beginning to take practical measures toward a more inclusive ministry to people at the various economic and cultural levels and in the various racial groups.

The matter of responsibility to people regardless of differences has been widely discussed by Christians in America in terms of the universal love and grace of God in Christ and in connection with the great commission. One would expect that American Lutherans would add as their contribution more than a sporadic emphasis upon the implications of justification by faith. Such a contribution would be extremely useful as it would serve to bring some of our gravest problems in America into direct contact with the individual's faith life.

Why have we, as Lutherans, tended to be so unaware of the practical implications of justification by faith in the matter of differences? The following historical developments seem to give a partial answer.

To begin with, it is remarkable how completely these implications of justification by faith were recognized in the areas of Europe where Lutheranism became established. That the Gospel is for all without distinction came to be a generally-accepted principle. In Scandinavia, especially, where Lutheranism overwhelmingly prevailed and where the population was homogeneous in character, the question ceased to be an issue, at least theoretically. The "Folk Church" of Sweden, for example, was a crystallization into concrete form of the idea of the universality of the Gospel.

Lutheran immigrants to America carried with them the prac-

tice of giving the Gospel to all, i.e., to all within their own nationalistic group. In Europe "all" had meant *all Germans*, or *all Swedes*, or *all Norwegians*. The immigrants had inherited the application of the principle in their own European situation, but not necessarily the principle itself as an implication of justification by faith. The battle had been fought and won so long ago that the weapons had been laid aside and forgotten. Hence, when the nationalistic and linguistic barriers in America began to crumble, the Lutheran immigrants and their descendants found themselves unpreparedly facing a situation in which new decisions had to be made concerning responsibility to other nationalistic, racial, economic, and cultural groups. They did not recognize clearly that the answer to their problems was implicit in their faith.

Thus, it has been possible for Lutherans in America to continue to speak confidently as the particular exponents of justification by faith for we have scarcely realized the practical implications of such a stand in the American scene. However, we have been aware of the dangers of legalism, for self-righteousness is a perennial problem. Consequently, we have tended to place all our armaments on the "seaward side" facing legalism, unaware that we are vulnerable on the "landward side" also in the matter of distinctions between people as it affects our policy of evangelism. The British error at Singapore thus has had its counterpart among us.

Also, we have been slow to see the practical implications of our faith because of the strong temptation to do the expedient thing when under pressure. When we yield to this temptation, we fail to admit that our policy is one of expediency; we say that we are being practical or realistic. In following such a course, we are prone to shut out any objective thinking which might become embarrassing. For example, the only policy of evangelism which will square with the implications of justification by faith is one which will call for a ministry to all of the people in a given community or at least to a cross-section of the population. Expediency discards this policy as not being practical or realistic. Statistics might be adversely affected; the income of the church might be reduced

through serving people in the lower-income brackets; social status might be imperiled if the distinctions between social strata are too sharply violated; painful controversy might be aroused by a thoroughly Christian approach to racial problems. Consequently, an appeal to faith is seen as a symptom of naïvete.

Rationalizations to justify a strong regard for statistics are not lacking. As one argument goes, if all souls are alike, why not serve those groups or areas where the greatest number can be won. The argument is clever, but it collides squarely with justification by faith. Alongside of God-given personal faith, it places a greater predicted response on the part of some groups than of others. Thus, a human factor is introduced. Moreover, this argument makes numbers a determining criterion along with divine grace. As the Rev. C. P. Rasmussen of the Lutheran Commission of Evangelism has remarked, "We are in danger of making the book of Numbers our Gospel."

The irony of it all is that, in the long run, even from the standpoint of numbers, a selective ministry will undoubtedly prove to be the most impractical and unrealistic of all. Among those hired to pick berries, the one who selects only the most accessible and the largest fruit is not the one who gathers the most nor who has the approval of the employer. We can be sure that, on the last day, the "well done" of the Lord of the Harvest will be directed to those who have labored in harmony with the will of God and in consonance with the spirit of the Gospel.

It is ironical that the church sometimes finds it necessary to initiate a special ministry to a group which has been neglected through an overemphasis upon differences. Such a ministry appears to call even more attention to the differences. How can this be justified? Such a special ministry may perform a valuable function which reminds one of the work of a physician or surgeon. The physician or surgeon gives special attention to an organ or a limb which is already causing undue attention. It is his objective, through that special care, to eliminate the causes of the illness and to facilitate healing so that the organ or limb can resume its

normal functions in the body without requiring any further special attention. Similarly, the ultimate objective of a special ministry must be to eliminate the necessity for its own existence by so arousing the conscience of the church that the members of the group it serves will be placed under the normal ministry of the church with the opportunity to make their own contribution to the life of the church.

Additional attention should also be given here to the tendency to be swayed by financial considerations into a selective ministry. The enticement in this direction is strongest in a free-church system and accounts in part for our slowness to reach the people in the lower economic brackets. Home mission boards, in their stewardship of funds for extending the church, have faced the temptation to plant churches only among people having sufficient resources to insure a rapid return of those funds. Such a return makes possible maintaining a rapid rate of founding new congregations. It is encouraging that some boards have recognized this temptation and are beginning to set aside funds to be used in ministering to people in blighted areas.

It is interesting to compare our situation with that which obtained in the time of the Reformation. When we study Rome's bitter fight against justification by faith, it is important to realize that the numerous masses, the indulgences, and the system of penances (through which Rome controlled the people) were important sources of revenue. Luther's attack upon every form of work righteousness thus struck a very sore spot. Likewise, the prerogatives of the various levels of the hierarchy involved or came to involve substantial material advantages which the elimination of distinctions between men would seriously jeopardize.

In our dealings with the implications of justification by faith in the Lutheran Church in America, the preaching of grace and faith is not the money question it was in the time of Luther. We can thunder against legalism quite safely except in isolated instances. However, with us today, the financial temptation is involved in the matter of making distinctions between people when

sharing the Gospel. Will we permit ourselves to be swayed, as was Rome, by material considerations?

In this whole financial matter we face the age-old question whether it is our purpose to use people as the means to build the institution or whether the institution exists to serve people. Only if the latter is true are we in harmony with the implications of justification by faith, for then we are free to serve people without respect of persons. The vital need to carefully re-think this whole matter with respect to the American scene is indicated by the fact that competition between Christian churches in America in opening new fields tends to be least marked in the areas of greatest all-around needs. It is in the areas where select groups live, groups which will particularly benefit the institution, that competition is apt to become sharp.

When we speak of "greatest need," are we not thereby introducing a criterion from the opposite side which violates equally much the principle of an impartial ministry? The apparent contradiction becomes all the more serious when we recall that Jesus, though rendering a total ministry, went out of His way to meet the greatest need. Likewise, Paul preferred to preach the Gospel where it had never been proclaimed before. He did, however, appoint elders to serve the needs of churches he had established, and He dealt with the problems of established churches through letters and also through visits when possible. A little reflection will show that particular concern for those in greatest need and for those lacking opportunity is the highest impartiality, actually serving to equalize things. A physician who serves the whole community is expected to minister first to those who need him most. When he follows this course faithfully, he is regarded as being most impartial.

How do we reconcile with all this the fact that the Gospel came first to the Jews? This involved fairness from another viewpoint. Israel had been used by God as the channel to bring salvation to the world. Given priority in responsibility within God's plan of redemption, it was only fitting that she should be the first to

taste of the fruit of that work. Moreover, a priority in opportunity was counterbalanced by a priority also in coming under judgment.

Now, it is significant that, in God's matchless and unfathomable wisdom, this fairness with Israel did not conflict in the least with the impartiality of His Gospel. Not even one generation of Gentiles was permitted to perish before the Gospel of completed redemption was sent out to the nations. Through Israel's general rejection of Christ, the Gospel became available almost immediately to the Gentiles and was carried throughout the known world within the first generation.

That the Gospel came first to the Jews actually became the means of more effectively serving the Gentiles. For example, when Paul started work in a new field, he went first to the synagogue or to the Jewish place of prayer if there were no synagogue. There he found a number of devout Jewish people with a rich spiritual background whom he was enabled to lead to Christ and whom he enlisted as co-workers. We are reminded here of individuals such as Lydia, Aquila, Priscilla, and Timothy (half-Jewish). Moreover, at the synagogue he met those among the Gentiles who were most earnestly seeking after God—inquirers as well as actual proselytes. These, too, became part of a strong nucleus of witnesses for a widespread ministry which was invariably precipitated by expulsion from the synagogue.

The same principle can be legitimately carried out today when a church body is opening a ministry through God's guidance in a given community, reaches first the Christians resident there. If the purpose is to minister just to an existing constituency which it has found in the community, the church involved is showing respect of persons. However, if the church has reached these people, not only to serve them, but to enlist them to evangelize the whole community, the initial contact with these people has shown a genuine concern for all which is on a higher plane than a mere mechanical impartiality.

Expediency has often tempted us to leave until last or to pass by entirely people having a sharply different religious background than ours, whether distinctly non-Christian or characterized by a

distorted gospel. These people may lack the blessing of justification by faith, not necessarily because they are maliciously opposed to it, but because they know nothing about it or have been schooled against it. The negative reactions and the stubborn resistance one often encounters in dealing with such, as well as the labor and heartache involved, tempt us to avoid them. However, faith must pass beyond a mere acceptance of the form or principle of justification by faith. Unless one believes in the power of the Gospel to save souls even in the most difficult circumstances, it is quite meaningless to speak of an impartial or universal ministry. In the measure that we in the Lutheran Church shrink away from witnessing under such circumstances, we are denying the real efficacy and power of the Gospel at the heart of which is revealed "a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written. But the righteous shall live by faith." To be sure, in any phase of our work, we face closed doors which we cannot and should not try to force. It is not ours to ride roughshod over the will of the individual. However, before abandoning any work as fruitless, it is well to make certain that those to whom we are witnessing have had adequate opportunity in the light of their background and that our witness in word and deed has been given in a spirit of love, helpfulness, and patience in consonance with the character of the Gospel we proclaim.

In the American scene, the Jewish people are the non-Christian group most apt to be passed by. This is no light matter as they represent the largest distinctly non-Christian group in America, numbering around 5,000,000. They cannot be easily avoided as they reside in the parish areas of about forty per cent of our congregations. To neglect them is serious in the light of the clear witness of the Scriptures that the Jews as well as the Gentiles need the grace of God in Christ. Particularly disturbing is the tendency among American Protestants today to think of friendliness toward the Jews as requiring the sacrifice of our Christian convictions and witness. Judaism and Christianity are spoken of as twin faiths, the former meeting the needs of the Jews and the latter serving the Gentiles. When Lutherans silently follow along with

this practice, they have, for all practical purposes, sold out their faith. Paul's strong witness in Romans and Galatians that man cannot be saved by the works of the Law and can only be justified by faith in Christ is thus trampled underfoot. It is impossible to think of a more open and direct denial of justification by faith than to compromise it in connection with Rabbinic Judaism—the very context in which Paul first gave us this vital truth with such power, earnestness, and conviction.

Again, the way of expediency tempts us with respect to our responsibility to people of various racial groups in America. A refusal to face racial distinctions in the light of the Gospel has been a particular cause for unchristian thinking and acting. Some are ready to pass over all other distinctions except that of race. Again, we say that, if salvation by grace alone through faith alone has the effect of removing *all* distinctions between men, then any policy of evangelism which regards such differences is a flagrant violation in practice of justification by faith. To maintain one difference so as to cause respect of persons has the same practical effect as to maintain one good work along with faith as a basis for justification. We sharply accuse the Roman Catholics and some other groups of Semi-Pelagianism. Our accusations become self-condemnation if we are "semi-universal" in our proclamation of the Gospel. Moreover, our regard for human differences in our evangelism actually keeps some people from being saved through faith (Romans 10:11-15).

There are those who hold that responsibility to racial groups can be discharged through a segregated program. It is true that such groups may often want to have their own congregations when possible, but what shall we do if people from congregations of a racially homogeneous character move to a community where there is no such congregation to serve them? Do we bring souls to life through the Gospel only to walk off and let them die? And what shall we do when people of other racial groups are too small in number to have their own congregations or do not want a congregation built on a basis of segregation? Is not our failure to have more congregations among various racial groups due to this

that prejudice often prevents a congregation located in an area of shifting population from actually making a transition? Can we expect a new congregation of another racial group to rise like a phoenix as soon as its white predecessor has expired or moved? And, if a transition is allowed, must not the possibility of a permanently mixed group be considered? Even if the question of intermarriage were as serious as many maintain, would it still be as great an issue as the salvation of eternal souls? These are unavoidable practical questions which the proponent of complete segregation must answer.

It can be confidently asserted that, unless the Lutheran Church of America very soon launches out decisively and fearlessly to eliminate respect of persons in the proclamation of the Gospel of salvation by grace alone through faith alone, she must cease to call herself a true exponent of justification by faith.

Furthermore, a failure to take a stand in this matter will have other detrimental effects. To serve principally where the greatest tangible results can be achieved with a minimum of effort, where the income can be readily calculated in advance, where social status can be preserved, and where bearing the cross of conflict and misunderstanding can be largely avoided is to invite rapid moral and spiritual deterioration. Faith becomes more and more anemic, and one's witness and confession become blunted through an evasion of anything that would serve as a foil to sharpen them.

A ministry which embraces all without distinction is a ministry which involves the crucifixion of the self-life, a complete reliance upon God, a commitment to patient toil, and disapproval and hatred from the world. It is one which brings the very cross which Jesus promised. Obviously, it normally involves a strong self-discipline—not a pharisaic display, but a careful stewardship of talents and resources which refuses the egocentric self-indulgence demanded by the flesh and which dedicates all to God for service to men. This is a discipline of love which is a direct corollary of justification by faith (Romans 12-16) and is not the product of Law. A degenerate Christianity, strongly on the defensive,

dishonestly brands such discipline as "legalism" or "pietism." In short, an appeal is made to justification by faith in order to discredit a direct corollary of justification by faith. This is the height of irony! If we follow these tactics, the accusation of legalism prevents any one from successfully convicting us of sin and neglect. We can deteriorate in peace.

This emasculating process is particularly serious in the face of expanding opportunities for an aggressive witness. America has largely eliminated her geographical frontiers, and our American people are rapidly losing the pioneer spirit in the midst of luxury and plenty. The church, however, is facing rapidly expanding frontiers, and we cannot afford to forfeit a pioneer spirit which acts in faith and which does not shrink from toil and hardship. Nor is the present world situation one which will make special concessions to and deal gently with an anemic and undisciplined faith.

Our theological stand also is affected. When we begin to regard differences between people, our vision of service to people obviously degenerates. Our theology then tends to become an end in itself rather than a means to enable us to bring the Word of God more effectively to human souls. In the measure that the doctrine of justification by faith becomes divorced from human need, it takes on the character of a fetish.

Moreover, as soon as the vision of ministering to people begins to fade, rationalism, the scourge of our age, takes over. Human reason becomes the great criterion, and the supernatural elements of our faith consequently become a problem to us. Our uncertainty and unbelief concerning those elements may then lead us into one of two courses. We may take the way of a theological liberalism which refuses to accept anything which cannot be demonstrated to the satisfaction of human reason. On the other hand, we may swing into a dogmatic fundamentalism which seeks to cover its gnawing doubts by formulating explanations for everything in answer to liberalism. Acting naïvely, such a fundamentalism tries to use the weapons of rationalism in order to fight rationalism, and thus becomes rationalistic itself.

However, when there is genuine concern for the *total* needs of *all* people, we soon discover our complete inadequacy to meet those needs. Then the supernatural elements of our faith, instead of being a problem, become an absolute necessity; and, as we step out to use them in faith, those elements become a matter of living experience as well. Such a universal ministry throws us into reliance upon a Source far beyond human resources. Hence, faith in God grows strong, and the sword of the Word is sharp in our hands. We do not as readily permit ourselves to be tricked by liberalism into a rationalistic defense of the Word. Rather our victory rests in humble and childlike faith in God, and in His Word.

A great stronghold such as Singapore might have its importance greatly diminished without suffering a direct attack. Usually, such a stronghold is one of a chain of bases and fortresses, and its effectiveness is largely neutralized if the other bases and fortresses are captured or destroyed. As we have been discussing an impartial Gospel ministry as an important implication of the doctrine of justification by faith, we have been conscious of the danger of confining ourselves too exclusively to this implication and even to the doctrine itself without adequate reference to other phases of our faith. Discovering the blind spots in our stand on this one doctrine is not enough. The doctrine of justification by faith is not the only Christian doctrine. It is extremely important, but not as basic, for example, as the teaching through the revelation in Christ that God is love and a God of grace. Moreover, what would our doctrine of justification by faith mean if our Christology were unsound? We would be justified by faith in whom? Hence, by not keeping this doctrine in its proper relationship with the whole content of our faith, we could easily lose its significance, falling through our own steadfastness. There are those who would gladly take advantage of a one-sided preoccupation with this doctrine, using it as a screen to cover their distortion of other vital elements of our faith.

When all this has been said, it remains that a Lutheran understanding of justification by faith can be a significant contribution, especially in the American scene where our church is a

minority group. We can render genuine service by revealing, through deed and word, the full implications of this doctrine as they bear upon the deepest needs of all men and as they relate to the problems which all Christians in America must face. In using this teaching to correct our own course and also to render humble service to others, we are not as likely to find in our emphasis an end in itself and a cause for self-exaltation, the one tendency which is most inimical to the very character of the doctrine itself.

Christian Higher Education and the Social Sciences

KARL H. HERTZ

THE century from 1850 to the present affords the social scientist a peculiarly appropriate mirror for that kind of self-congratulation at which man is so adept. For in these 100 years social science came into its own, and, too impatient to await the reception its merits might win for it in the judgment of its contemporaries, it proudly announced itself the ultimate science, the happy ending toward which the age-long struggle of humankind was moving in its efforts to shape the conditions of life somewhat more to human liking. The claim to pre-eminence turned out to be wishful thinking for the most part, although as recently as 1938 a president of the American Sociological Society promised that the last stage of the ascent of man was in fact the sociological stage.¹

I am not so sure that the promise of the social sciences is as bright a lamp for the wayward feet of man as some of its prophets have deemed it. Nothing is farther from my mind, however, than to disparage my bread and butter. For if the social sciences made extravagant claims in the past century, they also suffered from inexcusable neglect. Historical analysis of the curricula of Lutheran colleges confirms that observation. Speaking to the Faculty Conference at Rock Island in October, 1949, Dr. Conrad Bergendoff indicted Lutheranism for stopping short of its mission and failing to develop "a theory of culture which might represent the Christian view of the world and life."² I agree whole-heartedly with his indictment.

1 Ellsworth Faris, "The Promise of Sociology," *American Sociological Review*, III (1938), 1-12.

2 "The Lutheran College and Culture," *Journal of the Association of Lutheran College Faculties*, December, 1949, p. 8.

I am not here, therefore, to point with pride. On the contrary, I am here to accept a challenge, for I believe the failure does not lie in our theology but in what we have made and failed to make of it. Within the compass of this paper I should like to claim for the social sciences, not the place of pre-eminence at the academic banquet table, but at least that proper kind of wedding garment which will insure their admission with the rest of the guests.

Professional pride, if nothing else, prompts me to start with a reminder that the issues with which the social sciences deal can claim as great an antiquity as all the other evils that frail human flesh is heir to. If I may do a bit of archaeological probing (and archaeology too is in some respects a social science), I would like to uncover an early specimen of social science, a specimen whose relevance is still contemporary although its author has been dead for many centuries. Perhaps not the least paradoxical facet of this author's place in academic history is that the university student of the last century was probably better able and more likely to read him than the student of the present generation. For he wrote in Greek—about the troubles that beset his contemporaries as a great civilization, having reached imperial grandeur, slowly bled itself to death in internecine struggles. With the imaginative insight with which great scientists have found the universal in the particular, he undertook the task of setting before his readers "a true picture of the events which have happened, and of the like events which may be expected to happen in the order of human things." Thus Thucydides, the Athenian, defined the purpose of history and made it, as he claimed it would be, "an everlasting possession," by insisting that it be a mirror in which future generations could recognize familiar sequences and, tragically enough, similar catastrophes.

Nor was his claim merely rhetorical, for I intend to borrow light for one important proposition from his pages. In a pattern all too uncomfortably familiar in 1951 the trouble in the Peloponnese started in a faraway place, a Corinthian colony named Corcyra. By means of the connecting mechanism of treaties and alliances the fire that flared on the edge of the Greek world soon

had all Hellas aflame. You can read the account of the years of war and plague, of heroism and demagoguery, of imperialistic adventures and diplomatic double-talk in the pages of Thucydides' history. For my present purposes I want to draw attention to only a fragment of the narrative, the description of the revolution in Corcyra :

. . . During the seven days which Eurymedon after his arrival remained with his sixty ships, the Corcyraeans continued slaughtering those of their fellow-citizens whom they deemed their enemies ; they professed to punish them for their designs against the democracy, but in fact some were killed from motives of personal enmity, and some because money was owing to them, by the hands of their debtors. Every form of death was to be seen, and everything, and more than everything that commonly happens in revolutions, happened then. The father slew the son, and the suppliants were torn from the temples and slain near them ; some of them were even walled up in the temple of Dionysus, and there perished. To such extremes of cruelty did revolution go ; and this seemed to be the worst of revolutions, because it was the first.

For not long afterwards the whole Hellenic world was in commotion ; in every city the chiefs of the democracy and of the oligarchy were struggling, the one to bring in the Athenians, the other the Lacedaemonians. Now in time of peace, men would have had no excuse for introducing either . . . but when they were at war and both sides could easily obtain allies to the hurt of their enemies and the advantage of themselves, the dissatisfied party were only too ready to invoke foreign aid. And revolution brought upon the cities of Hellas many terrible calamities, such as have been and always will be while human nature remains the same, but which are more or less aggravated and differ in character with every new combination of circumstances. In peace and prosperity both states and individuals are actuated by higher motives, because they do not fall under the dominion of imperious necessities ; but war which takes away the comfortable provision of daily life is a hard master, and tends to assimilate men's characters to their conditions.

When troubles had once begun in the cities, those who followed carried the revolutionary spirit further and further, and determined to outdo the report of all who had preceded them by the ingenuity of their enterprises and the atrocity of their revenges. The meaning of words had no longer the same relation to things, but was changed by them as they thought proper. Reckless daring was held to be loyal courage ; prudent delay was the excuse of a coward ; moderation was the disguise of unmanly weakness ; to know every-

thing was to do nothing. Frantic energy was the true quality of a man. A conspirator who wanted to be safe was a recreant in disguise. The lover of violence was always trusted, and his opponent suspected. . . . In a word, he who could outstrip another in a bad action was applauded, and so was he who encouraged to evil one who had no idea of it. The tie of party was stronger than the tie of blood, because a partisan was more ready to dare without asking why. . . . The zeal of good faith was not divine law, but fellowship in crime. If an enemy when he was in the ascendant offered fair words, the opposite party received them not in a generous spirit, but by a jealous watchfulness of his actions. Revenge was dearer than self-preservation. Any agreements sworn to by either party, when they could do nothing else, were binding as long as both were powerless. But he who on a favorable opportunity first took courage and struck at his enemy when he saw him off his guard, had greater pleasure in a perfidious than he would have had in an open act of revenge. . . .

The cause of all these evils was the love of power, originating in avarice and ambition, and the eagerness of temper which is engendered by them when men are fairly embarked in a contest. For the leaders on either side used specious names, the one party professing to uphold the constitutional equality of the many, the other the wisdom of an aristocracy, while they made the public interests, to which in name they were devoted, in reality their prize. Striving in every way to overcome each other, they committed the most monstrous crimes; yet even these were surpassed by the magnitude of their revenges which they pursued to the very utmost, neither party observing any definite limits either of justice or public expediency, but both alike making the caprice of the moment their law. . . . Neither faction cared for religion; but any fair pretence which succeeded in effecting some odious purpose was greatly lauded. And the citizens who were of neither party fell prey to both; either they were disliked because they held aloof, or men were jealous of their surviving.³

These paragraphs focus our attention on issues which lie at the very heart of our contemporary time of troubles, for no matter how unwilling we may be to accept the predicament of twentieth century man, the use and the abuse of power, the terrifying disequilibrium between freedom and order, present us with inescapable issues. "The world is too much with us, late and soon, getting

3 Book III. Quoted from Francis Godolphin, ed., *The Greek Historians* (New York: Random House, 1942), I, 719-721.

and spending," and the condition of man is a universal predicament in which all of us are equally caught.

If then the condition of man is desperate, we ought to conduct a serious inquiry into the reasons why it should be so. We are all familiar, of course, with those diagnoses of our ailments which seek the source of the disease in some external evil. Adam blamed his wife, you remember, and Eve held the serpent accountable. And there are some today who can rest satisfied with blaming all our difficulties on the Cominform, without whose presence we should in their opinion be well on our way to Utopia. The Stalinist version of socialism certainly belongs among the major devils that beset us; the difficulty lies, however, in the fact that the rite of exorcism, to be truly effective, must be directed to the devils that already possess us as well as to those who possess others. And here we may well pause to consider the paradox at the center of our predicament. For although capitalism and its political counterpart, liberal democracy, and communism with its totalitarian institutions are implacable opponents, they are at the same time connected logically and in historical causation. As Eduard Heimann has pointed out, the principle of autonomous reason underlies them both, as it underlies all modern civilization. "This," as Heimann observes, "is the circle in which we are caught; the two conflicting ideologies are connected causally; they produce and reproduce each other."⁴

To inquire into the grounds for this vicious circle is nothing else than to search out the basic assumptions of Western civilization itself. In this paper I cannot offer adequate documentation for the propositions I am going to assert; the evidence is considerable and, so far as I am concerned, convincing. The thesis is this: the desperate condition of men in the twentieth century arises from false premises about freedom and order on which the social theories (political, economic, and psychological) of the past century have rested. Proceeding from false premises, we have blundered into well-nigh fatal conclusions.

4 "The West and the East," *Social Research*, XVI (1949), 46. See also Eduard Heimann, *Freedom and Order* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947).

The clearest exposition of these false premises concerning freedom and order can be found in John Locke's *Second Treatise of Civil Government*. Locke begins with the state of nature in which he finds man to be free, equal, and rational. This state presents men with certain discomforts and inconveniences, and so they proceed to join together in commonwealths, and the political community is born. That is, freedom exercised rationally gives rise to order. It does so because Locke assumes that there is a kind of pre-established harmony among individual interests. Because men are essentially rational, it follows that reason, which is the law of nature, "teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that, being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions."⁵ Given this overwhelming faith in the power of reason, Locke finds it not at all necessary to inquire into the irrationality of power.

A similar assumption about freedom, order, and pre-established harmony is basic to Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*. In the economic system which Smith propounds order follows from freedom quite automatically through the operations of the anonymous mechanisms of the market. He states his premise quite boldly: "Man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren, and it is vain for him to expect it from their benevolence only. He will be more likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and show them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them. . . . It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest."⁶ Private greed, in brief, produces common prosperity.

Neither Locke nor the other philosophers of the Age of Reason faced the problem of power in its full reality. They did not overlook the evils of government, but they discounted them as irrational and therefore accidental. Purge society of excrescences of earlier ages, of fraud and constraint, and restore to men the

5 (Chicago: Great Books Foundation, 1949), p. 4.

6 *The Wealth of Nations*, Book I, Ch. II.

rights which nature bestowed upon them in their origin, and order will reign and prosperity abound. The clearest, most naive expression of this faith in pre-established order is in the second part of Tom Paine's *The Rights of Man*. "Great part of that order," Paine tells us, "which reigns among mankind is not the effect of government. . . . It existed prior to government, and would exist if the formality of government was abolished. The mutual dependence and reciprocal interest which man has upon man, and all parts of a civilized community upon each other, create that great chain of connection which holds it together."⁷ Nor does Paine scruple to draw the ultimate conclusion: "Government is no farther necessary than to supply the few cases to which society and civilization are not conveniently competent. . . . The more perfect civilization is, the less occasion has it for government, because the more does it regulate its own affairs."⁸ That free men pursuing enlightened self-interest might collide with one another, that the lust for power and the greed of acquisition might corrupt men even under a republican form of government, that social order is as much an exercise of the police power as of the power of the syllogism—these were propositions strangely absent from the political treatises of the Age of Reason.

It is the doctrine of the natural identity of interests and its attendant assumptions about freedom and order which formed the core of the social theory of the modern world, whether in the form of individualism or of scientific socialism. Socialism differs from capitalism only in that it sees the natural identity operating at a later stage and through collective forms of rationality. But the basic assumption is the same. These are the premises from which men derived political platforms and in terms of which they wrote textbooks of economics.

And the premises were false. For it is not true that social order is the product of a series of individual choices. As Emil Durkheim so ably demonstrated in *The Division of Labor in*

7 *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York: The Citadel Press, 1945), I, 357.

8 *Ibid.*, 357-358.

Society, the unity of society is not the unity of utilitarian agreement, not the product of the mutual advantages derived from the various exchanges which individuals make in the marketplace. For what is omitted in any individual transaction is the body of binding rules which regulate the agreement. And these rules, which Durkheim found in the first instance in the legal systems of societies, exist prior to and independently of any individual agreement. For a contractual agreement brings men together only for a limited purpose, for a limited time. As such, it offers no adequate motivation for a continuously existing social order. To establish such order requires constraint and regulation; only within a framework of already existing order can the activities of the market be carried on. There is no such thing as pure competition, except under conditions of anarchy.

Durkheim made a further observation about the system of norms which constrain men to social order. For the central feature of the norms which regulate conduct is their moral character. Durkheim's study of the division of labor is, in his own words, "above all an attempt to treat the facts of the *moral* life by the method of the positive sciences."⁹ The order which society exhibits is always a normative order, involving the possession of common values and common attitudes. Without such a moral consensus a common life is impossible. From it the constraint which we call the police power is eventually derived.

In recent centuries the model form of the social group through which men have sought to give expression to their common values has been the voluntary association. The theory of consent was not, of course, an invention of the Protestant Reformation; nevertheless, it was in the Protestant nations that this doctrine flourished. One of its earliest expressions was in the constitution of the church; Luther himself was the first Protestant exponent of the power of the Christian congregation. For reasons which were primarily political rather than religious German Lutheranism

9 Preface in the First Edition, *The Division of Labor in Society*, tr. George Simpson (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1947), p. 32.

found its ecclesiastical expression in territorial churches rather than in congregational polity. It was in England, and consequently in America, that congregational doctrines of church government achieved importance. It is one of the paradoxes of Puritan New England, for example, that although church attendance was compulsory, church membership was voluntary. For a church, in the classic expositions of the covenant theology, was a body of believers who covenanted with one another and with God to live together according to the order of the Gospel. And if churches were voluntary associations, then surely a commonwealth is too. You can read one of the earliest arguments for the consent of the governed in John Winthrop's "Discourse on Arbitrary Government" of the year 1644.¹⁰

You can follow its course from then on in the Puritan Revolutions of the seventeenth century, through the Army debates of the English Civil War, when Colonel Rainboro, speaking for the private soldier in the Parliamentary Army, boldly asserted that "the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the richest he."¹¹ And from that time on the chorus swells: John Milton pleading for the execution of a tyrant and the freedom of the mind, John Lilburne calling even Cromwell to account, Gerrard Winstanley voicing the aspirations of the poorest of the poor for an acre of common land to dig, George Fox, James Nayler, and the whole host of publishers of the truth refusing false honor to empty forms and insisting that conscience be honored. Until in 1681 William Penn wrote the new principles into the first Frame of Government of the Province of Pennsylvania and less than a decade later John Locke gave the theory of consent its classic form in his *Second Treatise of Civil Government*.

Still, something was lacking. For what the men of the seventeenth century overlooked (except Thomas Hobbes, who was not

10 *Winthrop Papers*, IV (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1944), pp. 468-488.

11 The Army debates are reprinted in A. S. P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty* (London: J. M. Dent, 1938). For Lilburne see William Haller and Godfrey Davis, eds., *The Leveller Tracts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944). For Winstanley, George H. Sabine, ed., *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1941).

a democrat) was that the lust for power and the greed of acquisition are strong enough to pervert to their own uses even the most democratic of constitutions. For though men may begin with the consent of the governed, there is an inevitable drift toward oligarchy even in a democracy. Robert Michels has called this "the iron law of oligarchy" and formulated it in the following terms: "It is organization which gives birth to the dominion of the elected over the electors, of the mandataries over the mandators, of the delegates over the delegators. Who says organization, says oligarchy."¹² The rule holds true whether the social structure under study be a political party, a corporation (see Berle and Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*), a trade union, or a church. Always and everywhere power tends to drift into the hands of a few, and power, especially in the hands of those who are highly conscious of their own virtues, tends to corrupt.

It was against concentration of ecclesiastical power that Luther protested in his attacks on the papacy; it was against the tyranny of the professionally religious over the laity that he formulated the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers. Protestantism must always protest against the inevitable drift of affairs by which the religious life becomes the prerogative of a religious elite, by which the faith of the laity becomes implicit, and it seems sufficient that the clergy know the articles of faith and observe the more rigid norms of morality. This is the heresy of Rome, and it is in practice the very antithesis of catholic (i.e. universal) religion. The priesthood of all believers is a democratic doctrine, and it demands an alert and informed laity. The path of least resistance to which Protestantism has surrendered from time to time is a denial of the Holy Spirit; to preach down to a congregation is not merely an insult, to water down the Gospel into sentimental platitudes is not merely to become morally ineffective: it is to deny the light of the Gospel, to hide the truth, to attempt to keep the

¹² *Political Parties*, tr., Eden and Cedar Paul (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), p. 401.

Holy Spirit from speaking to the condition of man through the Word of God. It is practical atheism; and our churches are full of it.

The result of following the path of least resistance and of the iron law of oligarchy is the rise of a class of managers of affairs—political, economic, ecclesiastical. Power no longer, except at rare intervals is given effective expression from below; it filters down from above, from the elected boss to the appointed office-holder (the technical name for this species is bureaucrat), through the whole hierarchy to the lowest clerk. The meat on which this Caesar feeds is strong indeed, for he has grown great in our day. Examples abound, but following the precedent of Luther, I shall choose one from the church. The statistics are not at hand, but the fact is obvious. In the recent history of Protestantism in the United States, the number of boards and commissions, of executive secretaries and administrative assistants has multiplied at a rate many times faster than the gains registered in membership. The latter we measure in fractions; the former in whole numbers.

There have been results, of course. Measurable results, for statistics is the handmaiden of the modern bureaucrat. Ecclesiastical institutions today are financially more stable than ever before and more efficient. But Christian action somehow seems to spend itself primarily in committees and in resolutions passed from one committee to another, and then passed back again. In the weightier matters of the soul the leaders of the Protestant churches so often do not speak with authority in the name of the great inarticulate masses of the laity. The church secretaries go to conferences; they draw up resolutions and take stands—and at the grass roots nothing happens. For example, almost every major denomination in the country is on record through its leaders in official assemblies against the inexcusable wickedness of racial segregation. It is no longer news that the Christian churches stand for racial equality; it will be news indeed when local congregations begin to practice it.

The fault from the point of view of the social scientist does not lie primarily in persons; church leaders are not in general hypocrites; the fault lies in social structure. Let me illustrate with

an example from industry, lest the economists begin to feel slighted. Social organization in the Western world is a matter of rationalization; nowhere is this more true than in modern industry where efficiency in the form of technological rationality and complex systems of accounting is a major characteristic. Yet the very rationality of the economic order has a paradoxical result, for it brings into being a species of irrationality.

The achievement of mass production, viewed as a technological event, is one of the major triumphs of the human mind. It is at the same time the source of what one of the great social scientists of our time, Karl Mannheim, has called "substantial irrationality."¹³ For the very extent to which the individual is functionally integrated in a productive routine, co-ordinated by a group of managers from above, leads to a "trained incapacity" on his part to plan his work for himself, to exercise initiative, to make decisions. The rigorous requirement for conformity with specified patterns of action (blueprints) which modern production makes on the individual working man narrows his field of attention and renders unimportant any independent thinking on his part. As long as the familiar routines persist, they allow him to act with a certain sense of assurance. But disturb the equilibrium, remove the normal gratifications for which he strives, subject him to the uncertainties of the economic cycle and the terrors of war and rumors of war, and then watch the tensions mount and the anxieties multiply. Under the conditions of a totalitarian social order, in which the above conditions are permanent, the consequence is what Mannheim has aptly called "the organization of insecurity." Read George Orwell's last novel *1984* for a prophetic vision of such a society.

The very rationalization of life has left modern men in many respects more ignorant of the conditions under which they live than the Hottentot or the American Indian. As Max Weber pointed out on one occasion, "Unless he is a physicist, one who rides

13 *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, tr., E. A. Shils (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1940), Part I.

on the streetcar has no idea how the car happened to get into motion. . . . The savage knows incomparably more about his tools. . . . (He) knows what he does in order to get his daily food and which institutions serve him in this pursuit."¹⁴

In spite of the vast variety of technological devices for communication which the modern metropolis possesses, the average city dweller is more ignorant of community processes and community events than the American villager of a century ago. Here perhaps is the greatest tragedy of all; the breakdown of communication in our time. Experts from different fields find few common topics of conversation today. But the problem is not merely one of experts; it concerns us all. Bring together the members of a typical urban church, and what will they have in common to talk about. This is one of the major sources of the weakness of our city churches, for the members of a city church do not form a community; the mutual reinforcement of the religious conscience which comes from sharing a common life has been weakened and dissipated in the urban environment. We can have a strong Christian conscience only when we have a high intensity of inner activity in Christian groups. The anonymous character of contemporary urban religion, its fractional contact with the individual, has corrupted and undermined the moral consensus of the average congregation. It is this inner intensity of participation which is the strength of Communist party discipline, as it also is the strength of sectarian religion.

Let me note just briefly two other facets of the contemporary breakdown in communication. The first of these is the differential access to knowledge among the various strata of society; the picture which the average newspaper reader has of events often differs not only quantitatively and in precision from that of better informed persons; it frequently differs radically in kind and import. Compare, if you please, the story of the McCarthy crusade against Owen Lattimore as reported in the August *Harpers* with

14 "Science as Vocation," in Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, tr., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 139.

the accounts presented in the daily press.¹⁵ The second facet is the deterioration of communications in the making of foreign policy. The new method of diplomacy, as Edward Shils has remarked, is the joint product of Wilsonian liberalism and Leninism and combines mass propaganda with diplomatic negotiations with the result that the increased publicity given to every diplomatic move decreases the flexibility of negotiation.¹⁶ No better illustration is at hand than the reduction of the Security Council of the United Nations in the past month to a vast sounding board of propaganda and counter-propaganda. Every move on the diplomatic chessboard is broadcast to every corner of the globe (even speeches never actually made become the subject of political controversy), with the consequence that each successive diplomatic skirmish is measured directly in terms of fighting strength, and no one dares predict when the propaganda bluff will be called and the general conflagration will begin. The principle of "open covenants, openly arrived at" has in effect made the making of covenants well-nigh impossible.

In turning to the positive part of this inquiry into the condition of man, let me begin with a distinction. There is no such intellectual discipline as Lutheran sociology, or Lutheran economics, any more than there is Lutheran biology or Lutheran mathematics. There is, however, a discipline known as Lutheran social ethics. There ought to be—and this is my answer to Dr. Bergendoff—a discipline known as Lutheran social thought. Social thought, as I conceive it, is a comprehensive inquiry embracing both the factual contributions of the social sciences and the normative contributions of theology, philosophy, and ethics, attempting to give expression to a unified normative doctrine of man, society, and the cosmos.

From the social sciences this discipline would derive such propositions as Durkheim elaborated, that society is a normative

15 Alfred Friendly, "The Noble Crusade of Senator McCarthy," *Harper's*, August, 1950, pp. 34-42.

16 *The Atom Bomb in World Politics*, "Peace Aims Pamphlets," No. 45 (London: The National Peace Council, 1948), pp. 9-10.

order, that man is a being who makes value-judgments. The task it would set itself is simply this: in the light of the religious experience central to our faith (that God is a God of both mercy and justice) Lutheran social thought would inquire into the implications for our common life to be drawn from that experience. Does not the universal priesthood of believers have political implications? Does not the primacy of faith imply a doctrine of the relation of man to man? In the doctrine that state and home and work are natural orders, surely a political theory, a philosophy of family life, and an economic ethic are implicit. Our duty is to make them explicit.

The willingness to learn from science, both natural and social, which is an essential feature of social thought as I conceive it, means that Lutheran thinking must once and for all abandon the literalistic rationalism of the fundamentalist. For fundamentalism is a form of rationalism, as anyone can discover by reading that masterpiece of literal interpretation of the Bible, Tom Paine's *The Age of Reason*. If Lutheran social thought is to have any relevance to the contemporary predicament of man, Lutheran scholars cannot continue to ignore the intellectual revolutions symbolized by the names of Darwin, Marx, and Freud, for these have shaped the modern mind. If we fail to understand them and their contributions to human knowledge, we shall not have Lutheran social thought; we shall continue to have what we have had too much of already, simple "organized ignorance."

Let me indicate in the closing section of this paper the lines along which Lutheran social thought could develop. The initial impulse for Protestant principles of social order will be drawn from the principles of the Reformation itself. We all realize that Luther was not a political thinker, nor an economist, nor a sociologist; he was first and foremost a man of religion. There were, nevertheless, certain principles of social order implicit in the Reformation. Look, for example, at Luther's critique of the medieval papacy. It is a revolutionary criticism, for it asserts that society is generally corrupt and that the church by its perversion of the Gospel has been responsible for that corruption. (The source for

these statements is his *Address to the German Nobility*.) In other words, what men believe reflects itself in the structure of social relationships and in the values to which they give their loyalty. Nor did Luther content himself with asserting this doctrine negatively. Here is the first paragraph of his explanation of the First Commandment in the *Large Catechism*:

The simple meaning of this commandment is, You shall worship me alone as your God. What do these words mean and how are they to be understood? What is it to have a god, or what is God? Answer: A god is that to which we look for all good and where we resort for help in every time of need; to have a god is simply to trust and believe in one with our whole heart. As I have often said, the confidence and faith of the heart alone make both God and an idol. If your faith and confidence are right, then likewise your God is the true God. On the other hand, if your confidence is false, if it is wrong, then you have not the true God. For the two, faith and God, have inevitable connection. Now I say, whatever your heart clings to and confides in, that is really your God.

I do not think we have ever fully explored the revolutionary import of this paragraph. For it means this: the religion of any society can be defined in terms of its loyalties; if the ultimate values of a society are blood and soil, or race, or democracy, or money, or the atom bomb, or any other man-made object, including particular ecclesiastical institutions, the religion of that nation is a form of idolatry; even if these doctrines be preached in all the churches of the land in the name of Christianity. Here is the prophetic heart of Protestantism as a critique of the social order. The scientific corollary is this: the history of human culture, which is the history of human loyalties, is nothing other than the history of religion.

Protestantism as Luther gave it expression is a prophetic religion.¹⁷ For that reason, despite the strictures of Matthew Arnold

17 I owe the terms "prophetic" and "sacramental" as here used to Professor James Luther Adams, Meadville Theological School, The University of Chicago, to whom I am very deeply indebted for stimulating much of the thinking which has gone into this paper. For a detailed discussion of their meaning, see James L. Adams, "The Religious Problem," in George B. Huszar, *New Perspectives on Peace* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944), pp. 227-254.

against "the dissidence of dissent, and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion," the prophetic mood which refuses to absolutize any human category or any contingency of history belongs to the essence of Protestantism. To serve any other God than the unconditional Sovereign, the Omnipotent Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is idolatry. No sin is more tempting than to put a human creation, whether it be a scientific doctrine or, for that matter, a system of theology, in the place of God. We are constantly tempted to demand loyalty to the relative. Here Protestantism must continue to remain Protestant and forever demand that man let God be God indeed.

And to be true to its mission, the prophetic criticisms must not exclude the church. It is part of the genius of Luther and of Lutheranism that it has never absolutized any particular form of church organization. The church exists wherever the Word is rightly preached and heard and the Sacraments are rightly administered, whether the form be episcopal, presbyterian, or congregational, for visible church organizations are man-made devices; they are relative, not absolute; therefore subject to corruption, constantly in need of vigorous moral scrutiny, lest man pervert them to idolatrous purposes.

But religion cannot exist on negation alone. Nor did Luther let the matter rest there. For in addition to the prophetic principle, he asserted a sacramental one, a principle of seeing the divine in material forms. One source of this principle is in his explanation of the First Article in the Small Catechism with its homely and yet religiously profound listing of the good things that God provides, "clothing and shoes, meat and drink, house and home, wife and child, land, cattle and all my goods." For the work of the Creator is good, and human forms and organizations, properly understood and rightly used, belong among the blessings of life. Thus Luther in his social ethics could command men to come out of the monasteries into which they had fled in world-denying zeal and insist that they return to the great natural orders of the home, the workshop, the magistracy, and the school.

For we have a calling from God to work in this world, not

indeed to achieve our salvation, but rather to give effective expression to the salvation which is ours by the grace of God. The doctrine of vocation, asserted first by Luther, developed further by Calvin and made a first principle of ethics by the English Puritans, belongs with the historical causes of that great revolutionary transformation out of which the modern world was born. I cannot rehearse that history here. But one point is clear. In Protestant thought the world and all its callings are sacred. There are no secular or profane spheres beyond the borders of the sovereignty of God. This does not mean that these realms belong under the jurisdiction of the church. The church has its proper work to do; and so also have state and school, home and industry. Even in seventeenth century New England, whose Protestantism no man can doubt, the independence of the orders of nature was maintained. For in Puritan Boston the marriage ceremony took place before the magistrates, not before the clergy, and no man called into court could appeal to the canon law or plead benefit of clergy. The Bible Commonwealth of the Massachusetts Bay was the most secular state in Christendom in its structure, because its Protestant founders took the doctrine of the orders of creation seriously.¹⁸

We must, however, come to terms with one objection, that which arises from the doctrine of total depravity. That doctrine is an extreme statement of the prophetic principle of religion. God is the all-sufficient source of salvation; man cannot possibly save himself. Yet if we press the doctrine too far, we have left a religion that views "the world" as irredeemably evil and that asserts by implication that God intends it that way. This perverted sacramentalism which by doing nothing asserts that whatever is, is right is basically amoral. You may recognize this social amoralism in that perverse form of Protestantism which calls itself fundamentalism.

But do not hang this sort of ethics on Luther. For Luther balanced total depravity with a doctrine of civic righteousness.

18 The clergy, e.g., were barred from membership in the General Court. Magistrates could not be held accountable before the congregation for official actions. Education and poor relief were entrusted to the towns.

Man can make distinctions between good and evil that are relevant, so long as he does not absolutize them into means of grace, so long as he does not confuse a particular social order with the Kingdom of God. It is true that man is in a fallen condition, but that condition is not one of complete anarchy. It is an order, a moral order, but a conditional one. It finds its theological form in the doctrine of law. For in the present condition of man, including Christian man, the Law remains, not indeed as the source of redemption, but as a guide for action in the natural orders of life. For the Gospel does not proclaim the end of the Law, but the fulfilment of the Law. It proclaims that fulfilment, moreover, for all the relations of man. In the New Testament it is taken for granted that the rise and fall of nations, the taking of a Roman census when "Cyrenius was governor of Syria," and the dispensation of justice when Pilate was procurator of Judea, serve, as all human events do, to effect the purposes of God's just and merciful, God's redeeming will for man.

So the Lutheran turns to biblical theology to find sacred purposes in profane events, in family and workshop, in courtroom and classroom. At the same time, remembering the fallen condition of man, *simul justus et peccator*, he will not deify the relative. Only God is infallible and eternal, not any human invention, any social order, any political or economic doctrine, nor any ecclesiastical machinery. Lutheran social thought, building on the prophetic protest of the Reformation and its sacramental insights, can offer a body of propositions about man and society and the cosmos which can speak to our present desperate condition.

Notes and Studies

CROSS AND CREATION

H. T. LEHMANN

The prologue to the Fourth Gospel tells us of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Logos. The opening phrase of the Prologue, ἐν ἀρχῇ, establishes the point of contact with Genesis 1:1: *bereshit*. Incarnation and Creation are seen in their intimate relationship to one another. How are these events in biblical history linked so closely to one another? The answer to this question is to be found in the Cross.

The prologue clearly points out that the good creation of God is marred and defaced by man's love for darkness rather than the light. The yawning chasm of death is the destiny of men who cling to βίος as ζωή in their blindness. The knowledge of man has become polluted so that it is no longer "wisdom and power of and unto God." The deceit of sin is continually perverting the truth of God into the half-truths and substitute truths of men. A giant displacement of the moral foundations of man is continually taking place in history, so that all of man's enterprises are out of perspective. Like the havoc wrought by a major geological fault in the earth's surface, the harmonious relationship of filial obedience between man and God has been destroyed. All endeavors of man are out of perspective because life is no longer seen *sub specie aeternitatis Dei*.

This critical crevice in God's creation is the signature of the cross in the world of men.¹ Christ, the Incarnate Word, who was before the beginning of the Κόσμος, whose creation the Κόσμος is—

1 According to Paul the whole creation, not only the world of man, is split by a critical crevice which causes it to groan and travail. But there will be a day of deliverance from its corruption. Cf. Romans 8:19-22. It is the view of the Book of Jonah that the beasts in the city of Nineveh must do repentance since they are also included in the promise of deliverance.

Him the Κόσμος does not know: it rejects Him. He comes to the children of men whom He creates and sustains—to His very own people, and they refuse to receive Him. He is the Light of the world, yet men prefer daemonic darkness to the divine light. In this perverse preference of unbelief lies the pain of the cross.

According to the Prologue the Eternal Logos enters this world "full of grace." Christ is "replete with grace!" This unfolds the motive for Christ's act of incarnation: the Logos ἁσάρκως becomes the Logos ἐνσάρκως in order to enter fully into the limitations of human existence—in order to take upon himself life's meaningful meaninglessness. He "pitches his tent among us," like a man leading a nomadic existence, in a little strip of land along the eastern shore of the Mediterranean for perhaps thirty-three years. He who is Truth lives among men who deceive and are deceived; He who is Life lives among men who, though alive, are dead without Him; He who is Light dwells among men who love darkness. This is His grace.

The purpose of this gracious incarnation is to heal the rift in God's creation. From beginning to end this was only possible through the cross.

The connecting link between the creation and the incarnation is the cross. It is this in a twin-relationship: on the cross, Christ suffers because of man's proud perversion; yet through this suffering of the cross the redemption of God's creation is wrought. This is the miracle of grace.

Creation and incarnation are so closely linked to one another in the prologue to the Fourth Gospel because the incarnation gives cosmic significance to the cross.

This quality of the incarnation becomes evident in the parallelism which exists between the prologue of the Fourth Gospel and the opening chapter of Genesis.² The incarnation of the Logos is the embryonic and ever unfolding "beginning" of the re-creation of God's whole creation. As the sun is the light of the physical world, so Christ is the light of the moral world. Both "lights" are

² Walter Lowrie, *The Doctrine of St. John*. An Essay in Biblical Theology (London: Longman's, Green & Co., 1899), pp. 113-118.

the life of the world. However, a twofold aspect of life is involved: life as βίος and as ζωή. "In the beginning" man had both βίος as physical existence and ζωή as spiritual life. ζωή is lost through disobedience against God. Recreation through the incarnation of the Logos restores the potentiality of ζωή as fellowship between God and the world of man.

At this point it becomes evident that the relationship between Genesis 1 and John's prologue is not only a literary parallelism: there exists a parallelism in content. As the creation of the world is a cosmic event occurring through the power of God's spoken word, the recreation of the world is likewise a cosmic event brought about through the incarnate Word. The cosmic significance of Christ's first coming may be seen in the search of the Hellenists in John's Gospel as expressed in the words, "We would see Jesus"; the "signs" which accompanied Jesus' death on the cross such as the darkness which covered the "whole inhabited earth," the quaking of the earth, the rending of the veil in the temple.

The cosmic significance of the incarnation implies further that history has been effected and changed. With the coming of Christ into the life of man a new aeon has begun. The era *ante Christum natum* and *post Christum natum* indicate that in Christ's incarnation human history has a new beginning. But these two eras are not rent asunder, as though the one did not have any relation to the other. For example, the old age is not all darkness and the new age "pure light." This was the Gnostic misinterpretation of the incarnation in history. It should also be remembered that the "new beginning" in the incarnation of the Logos does not mean that history has been "broken in two" by the event of Jesus' coming. Here lies the error of much Barthian thinking. The incarnation means that the era *ante Christum natum* finds its fulfillment in the new aeon of *post Christum natum*. History is now pregnant with deeper meaning and through the union of Christ with humanity's destiny has the potentiality of godward direction in greater measure.

This new potentiality exists through the latent power of Christ's redemptive cross—a power which becomes active in and

through faith. This victorious power of the cross becomes evident in the struggle between darkness and light, for the darkness has not been able to put the light out. The suffering of the cross receives such heart-rending expression in the words of the prologue: "He was in the world and the world was made through Him, and the world knew him not." Christ, as Logos, is the Creator-Redeemer of the cosmos. The world is his by virtue of his power as creator and his love as redeemer, yet He allows the world to reject him. However, the latent dynamic love of such suffering becomes active in all those who receive him. They are not only his children through creation but also through redemption. They have their being from God in that total, twofold sense. They are born again. The Holy Spirit makes the suffering, redemptive, victorious power of the cross active in their lives. The given potential becomes active in history. The cross of Christ gives God's wayward creation its homeward direction.

This "homeward direction" points to the end. The prologue to the Fourth Gospel does not only point back to the beginning of time, but in the performance of this very task it also points forward to the end of time. Jesus Christ existed before the beginning of time. As the pre-existent Christ He is referred to frequently as the Λόγος ἀσάρκως. When Jesus Christ became flesh He entered into time. In this state of existence theology speaks of Jesus as the Λόγος ἐνσάρκως. The prologue refers to the act of incarnation in the words ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. The state of existence resulting from this act is described as ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. The Λόγος ἐνσάρκως pitched his tent among us. That is to say, Jesus Christ dwelt on earth only for a time. From this it follows that Jesus' disciples are not to regard their life on earth with any degree of finality. They, too, are merely "tenting" on earth. The time is coming when they shall be where their Lord is now.

The disciples of Jesus are and at the same time they are becoming God's children. The life of the children of God is constantly moving toward a goal, namely, eternal fellowship with God. As many as receive Jesus Christ, to them God gives the power to be

and to become the children of God. God's children may have the certainty of faith that they are moving in a "homeward direction."

"Becoming" children of God does not mean a steady upward climb in goodness and holiness, measurable in terms of empirical standards. Christians are not "climbing Jacob's ladder" to heaven on which "every rung goes higher, higher." Not only justification but also sanctification is and must remain the object of faith in the Holy Spirit. "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ or come to Him, but the Holy Spirit has called me by the Gospel. . . ." In this faith there is only one growth: the realization that the struggle between good and evil, right and wrong, light and darkness grows in fierceness and intensity. As long as we are in this life we shall always remain both sinner and saint. As the Fourth Gospel points out so eloquently, the disciples of Jesus constantly find themselves in the cross fire of faith and unbelief while in the state of "becoming."

This "fight of faith" is the signature of the cross in the life of the children of God. It is our cross in the power of His cross. This is so because the Christian is at the same time God's wayward and redeemed creature. Release from such cross-bearing can only come with the ultimate victory of the Light over darkness, of the Truth over deceit, of Faith over unbelief. In pointing to this *ἔσχατος* the prologue of the Fourth Gospel points beyond itself. In pointing to the beginning of the world, the creation, it implies the end of the world, the consummation. Thus the cross in the incarnation of the Logos gives redemptive meaning to that history which lies between "the beginning" and "the end."

PRESIDENT OR BISHOP

GEORGE DRACH

The following resolution concerning the titles of the officers of the United Lutheran Church in America was adopted by its Philadelphia convention in October, 1948:

That a special commission be appointed by the President to study the

possibility of revising the titles of the officers of the United Lutheran Church in America to make them conform more clearly to churchly and historical usage, and to present its recommendations to the next convention of the United Lutheran Church in America.

The appointed special committee of four clergymen and one layman presented its report to the Des Moines convention in October, 1950. After some discussion the following recommendations were adopted:

A. Having sought to give serious attention to the total situation, and believing that the present titles used to designate the officers of the Church are adequate for the administration of the Church, your commission recommends unanimously that no change in these titles be made now.

B. In conclusion, realizing that Lutheranism in America may eventually elect to adopt the episcopal title for its leadership, we believe that this matter might profitably be discussed in general assemblies of the Lutheran bodies of America; therefore, we recommend that the Executive Board of the United Lutheran Church be requested to use its efforts to have this subject of ecclesiastical titles placed on the agenda for discussion in future general assemblies of the Lutheran churches of America.

Agitation for changing the title "president" to that of "bishop" is nothing new in the Lutheran Church in America. Professor Charles M. Jacobs advocated it in a speech at a meeting of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania several years before he died. The Rev. Charles Elvin Haupt, pastor of Grace Lutheran church of Lancaster, Pa. from 1888 to 1920, and others in his day and since, suggested the change. As early as the time of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the Rev. William Christopher Berkenmeyer, while pastor of the Dutch Lutheran congregation in New York City, proposed an episcopal form of government for all Lutheran congregations in America, whether Dutch, German, or Swedish. It appears that the purpose of all these suggestions was to add dignity and perchance more power and authority to presiding officers, although it seems to us that they lacked a full recognition of what the change involves in church polity as applied to conditions and circumstances in America church life.

It is true that the title bishop has both scriptural and historical sanction, and that the designation president for a church officer does not have these sanctions; but the title president has been used and accepted in American church government in conformity with the ideology and usage of American political institutions and social organizations, because in a republic like the United States monarchical or hierarchical titles are objectionable, repulsive, and undemocratic.

It is also true that the title bishop has been retained in some European Lutheran Churches and more recently has been introduced in Germany in place of the title superintendent. But it is likewise true that American Lutheran pastors and congregations with European ancestry and background deliberately have discarded the title bishop and have adopted the American polity of democratic practice in their church government as being more suitable and satisfactory.

All Lutherans, whether they are advocates of retaining the title president or of changing to bishop, know that they are to be governed by the principle of our Lutheran Confessions as stated in the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession, that it is "not necessary that human traditions, rites and ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike." Titles of church officers belong in that category. The wisdom of this confessional principle has been demonstrated many times in the course of Christian history, from the days in the apostolic church when "bishop" and "presbyter" were two titles for the same office, to the present days of the application of democracy in the church as well as in the state in America. The ardent advocates of the title bishop, therefore, should be restrained by their allegiance to the Augsburg Confession, lest they make what is a matter of indifference more vital than what is essential in the faith and life of the church.

As long ago as 1902 the question of church polity, as related to the titles of church officers, was under discussion at the Second General Conference of Lutherans in America, held in Philadelphia, Pa. At that conference the Rev. Jacob Fry, pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Reading, Pa., and grandfather of the present

president of the United Lutheran Church in America, read a paper entitled "Problems in Church Polity." He declared:

The Lutheran Church from the beginning laid all stress on faith and doctrine and placed forms of government among those things which should be left to the liberty of the Church. She had remembered the words of St. Paul that, while there was one Lord, there were differences of administration and diversities of operation. In the history and development of the Church she has recognized and adopted episcopal, synodical and congregational forms of government as times and circumstances made best.

It is the firmly established Lutheran church polity that the power of the church lies in its congregations of believers and not in any distinct order or class of clergy. Therefore, when congregations unite in synods and general bodies they transfer through chosen representatives some of their powers to the larger bodies for the sake of good order, mutual protection, and the pursuit of common interests and activities. This means that authority does not descend from bishops to pastors and congregations but ascends from congregations with their pastors to the organized synod and then to the more general body for more united and efficient action. So the American Lutheran Church polity becomes twofold: primarily and fundamentally congregational, and for active common cooperation it is synodical through representative delegates. It can, therefore, be said that the American Lutheran Church government is closer than any other to the republican form of civil government in the United States.

Again we quote Dr. Jacob Fry:

There is a parallel between our Church polity and the national polity under which we live. Both began as experiments which have had an historical development. As that which at first was colonial has become federal in the nation, so that Church polity which at first was largely congregational has become more and more synodical. We are not afraid of this, albeit we need to watch lest history repeat itself in the tendency to imperialism—the setting up of a monarchy in the nation and a hierarchy in the Church.

Whether they realize it or not, those who press for the change

from president to bishop advocate a step in the direction of such a dangerous tendency. They may say that all they want is to enhance the dignity of the presiding head of the synod and, then perhaps, as another step in the same direction, to dignify the head of the general body with the title of archbishop; but having taken these steps, as church history abundantly proves, sooner or later a form of hierarchy will develop.

It should not be overlooked that the introduction of the title bishop would call for radical changes in the constitutions of congregations, synods, and general bodies. Furthermore, for the general body or the synod to decide to introduce the title bishop is a wrong procedure because, if the change is to be made at all, it should be made by a plebiscite of the congregations to which final authority belongs. Is it not clearly evident that our congregations would not supinely submit to the change if all that is involved is clearly understood?

There are other practical difficulties, such as the position of the smaller synods which cannot afford a full-time paid president. It surely would not be advisable and good to have a bishop at the head of one or more of the larger synods and not of the smaller synods. It would be even less advisable to have one general body adopt an episcopal form of government with a bishop at its head without consulting other Lutheran general bodies and gaining their agreement also to adopt this form with its titles, especially since the merging of all Lutheran general bodies is being widely discussed and is favored by some. As for the presidents of synods, large and small, or of the general bodies, it is to be seriously doubted that any of them would deliberately choose the titles of bishop and archbishop.

Those in favor of the title bishop are likely to point to other American church bodies which have bishops and still function under our democratic form of civil government. There are three such churches with nation-wide constituencies and influence, as well as a number of smaller churches.

The Roman Catholic Church is historically and ecclesiastically hierarchical. To mention only one thing, no Lutheran in his right

mind would want a bishop who has almost unlimited power and authority over congregations and their property. The Roman Catholic bishop holds the titles to all the properties of the congregations. Dr. Jacob Fry facetiously remarks that the Roman Catholic bishop holds the power of the keys in a very literal sense because he can order the church doors locked until his regulations and requirements are obeyed.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has a kind of bishop which would not suit Lutheran pastors and congregations. They would not want bishops over them who would have the constitutional right to decide who is to be the pastor of the congregation. Our Lutheran congregations would not want to relinquish to any bishop the right to select and appoint their pastors. As it is, some of our Lutheran pastors and congregations at times have been irked by even the limited authority which presidents of synods have assumed over pastoral relations, salutary as it may have been in certain cases.

Another church which has bishops is the Protestant Episcopal Church, offspring of the Church of England. Its policy like its theology is middle-of-the-road. But does our American Lutheran Church want bishops and archbishops who are supposed to enjoy apostolic succession with divine authority in the rule of the church? Do our Lutheran congregations want bishops who alone have the right and authority to admit members into the church by confirmation and to ordain ministers? Do our Lutheran people want rectors, curates, vicars and canons, all of them titles which are churchly but no more biblical than president?

Do those who advocate the title bishop want our American Lutheran Church to have a stronger and improved church government from the head downward? The title itself will not do it. As it is, the office of a full-time paid president of synod and of the general body is gradually growing in authority and influence which, if kept within bounds, is not to be disparaged. There are some presidents who are more truly bishops in spirit and practice than some who in other churches are called bishops. It depends on the man who holds office.

A bishop is supposed to hold office for life even if he is incompetent. Who wants that in our American Lutheran Church? Presidents, as we now have them, are subject to re-election, and there is little difficulty in getting rid of unworthy or incompetent persons. Let it stay that way. It is better so.

Dr. Jacob Fry closed his study of this subject with a sentence which makes sense: "The remedy for any weakness in our Church polity is not in a radical change of that polity but in doing what we can to strengthen and improve it."

Book Reviews and Notices¹

Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. Edited by James B. Pritchard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. xii, 526 pages. \$15.00.

This book contains translations of epigraphic materials illustrating the history, religion, and culture of Near Eastern peoples with which Israel was in contact during all stages of its history. These translations are made by eleven recognized experts in ancient Near Eastern philology under the editorship of James B. Pritchard, professor of Old Testament at Crozer Theological Seminary.

A standard reference work which sums up adequately generations of expert scholarship and places into the hands of students a fine and indispensable tool is not published every day. For students of the Old Testament *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* is such a work.

The time is surely past when it is necessary to point out to students of the Old Testament the importance of the history and literature of the peoples which made up Israel's larger environment. For this book is not without precursors. Approaching it in range and competence, and serving as a standard which must be met and exceeded, is *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder*, edited by Prof. Hugo Gressmann (second, and greatly expanded, edition published in 1926), the first edition of which appeared in 1909. This book has been the standard collection of translations of Near Eastern sources for those who read German and will probably be enlarged and brought up to date as soon as conditions in Germany permit. Students who are unable to read German (and are not specialists in Near Eastern philology—whose number is not legion!) have until now been greatly handicapped

in their attempt to understand the environment of Israel from source materials, for many English translations of Near Eastern texts have appeared only in technical publications. Some works partially filled the non-technical reader's needs. The most popular and widely used of these has been Part II of George Barton's *Archaeology and the Bible* (7th edition, 1937), which offered "Translations of ancient documents which confirm or illuminate the Bible."

Even though *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* is the "largest collection of translations of texts relating to the Old Testament yet made" (xv), the editor and his distinguished collaborators were faced with difficult problems of selection. Two criteria controlled the selection. First, texts were chosen which had been cited in recognized commentaries, either because of the appearance of a biblical name, because of the treatment of a biblical theme, or because they represented a type of literature prominent in the Old Testament. Secondly, texts were chosen so that there might be given representative types of literary expression from each of the cultural and linguistic areas of the ancient Near East. Notable is the inclusion of representative Hittite texts.

Since the attempt is made in these selections to give as complete as possible a picture of the life of Israel's neighbors, the editor, following the suggestion of one of the collaborators, has arranged the texts according to literary types. They are: 1. Myths, Epics, and Legends. 2. Legal Texts. 3. Historical Texts. 4. Rituals, Incantations, and Descriptions of

1 Books received or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

Festivals. 5. Hymns and Prayers. 6. Dactylic and Wisdom Literature. 7. Lamentations. 8. Secular Songs and Poems. 9. Letters. 10. Miscellaneous Texts. The bulk of the translated texts offered is under the first six rubrics.

Reference to possible relationship, parallel, and contrast to material in the Old Testament is given in footnotes to the translations and in a special index. No claim is made that these references are exhaustive. Indeed, use of this collection of source materials by students of the Old Testament should lead to a recognition of more parallels and contrasts than have until now been noted.

As a rule each translation is preceded by a brief introduction. These introductions include a title, which provides a clue to the content, assignment of geographical origin, date of composition and actual writing of the text, listing of original and official publication, important translations, and bibliographical references to discussions or commentaries. In the case of especially obscure texts a brief explanation is given. The introductions are kept as brief as possible and are printed in smaller type so that they do not obtrude upon the text of the translation itself. Footnoting is frequent and helpful, but done typographically in such a manner that it is accessible but not obtrusive. In this way the book will serve all classes of readers, the reader who attempts to gain a general impression of the text, the student who should be led to pursue his studies further, and the specialist who wishes to check the translation.

The translations represent the results of up-to-the-minute scholarship. The reader can identify the translator of any text. A careful system of notation is employed to designate lacunae, conjectures, and doubtful renderings. While the non-technical reader may be disturbed by this, it is a welcome expression of the candor of true scholarship. Reviews in technical journals by specialists in the various

branches of philology represented will no doubt carry on a painstaking discussion of linguistic detail.

A list of the translators by language (all are connected with North American schools) is in itself a heartening evidence of scholarly cooperation. Egyptian texts are translated by John A. Wilson; Sumerian texts by S. N. Kramer and A. Leo Oppenheim; Akkadian texts by E. A. Speiser, Albrecht Goetze, T. J. Meek, A. Leo Oppenheim, A. Sachs, F. J. Stephens, R. H. Pfeiffer, and W. F. Albright; Hittite texts by Albrecht Goetze; and Northwest Semitic Texts (Ugaritic, Aramaic, and Hebrew) by H. L. Ginsberg and W. F. Albright.

This is a beautiful piece of bookmaking. In quarto format, the text is printed two columns to the page. Three indexes make the book more useful for all types of students. The first index lists the contents by language, the second lists biblical references, and the third offers an index of proper names.

Princeton University Press deserves the thanks of all students of the Old Testament for what should be a standard reference work for years to come.

A. J. ENGELBRECHT

Hebrew Origins. By Theophile James Meek. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. Revised Edition, 246 pages. \$3.00.

This work was originally published in 1936. In this revision the author, who is professor of Oriental Languages at the University of Toronto, has reworked the entire volume. The bibliography has been brought up to date and other changes reflect new knowledge in a variety of aspects, including the chronology of the ancient Near East. The six chapters of the book can be conveniently consulted as fairly complete essays on their respective subjects. They deal in succession with the origins of the Hebrew people, and of their law, their God, their priesthood, their prophecy. The last chapter is a thorough-going treatment of a subject

which is being widely discussed in current theological literature, the "Origin of Hebrew Monotheism."

Professor Meek has long been favorably known to a wide circle of readers in the United States. As a co-translator with Leroy Waterman, J. M. P. Smith, and Alex R. Gordon of the Old Testament section of *The Bible, An American Translation*, brought out twenty years ago by the University of Chicago Press, he has made the Old Testament live again for all who have sought the help of this competent modern translation. Specialists and theological students will now give a warm welcome to this study of Hebrew origins because of its comprehensive scope and deep learning. Those who failed to notice its first appearance fourteen years ago will do well to turn to it now in its revised form. The parish minister who ordinarily avoids technical works in the Old Testament field should not hesitate to look into it, for it is not only readable but also instructive and informative throughout. The best chapters, for one who is pressed for time, are II, on the Origin of Hebrew Law, and V, on the Origin of Hebrew Prophecy. Here the results of contemporary archaeological research have made possible a comparative treatment of Hebrew and non-Hebrew law and prophecy, with the neighbors and predecessors of ancient Israel in full view. The conclusions of our author favor the originality and independence, as well as the superiority, of the Hebrew tradition. The whole discussion is rich in new materials.

Chapter I is the most important chapter in the book. It should not be read in haste, for it presents an original and challenging view of the historical origin of the Hebrew people. According to Meek's hypothesis only the tribes of Judah and Levi were originally in Egypt and participated in the exodus under Moses. Canaan was invaded twice, not once, by the Hebrews. The two invasions have been combined into one in the Biblical tradition by "fore-shortening." Judah attacked

Canaan from the south late in the thirteenth century B. C.; but the Joseph tribes under Joshua entered the country much earlier, at the end of the fifteenth century, by way of Jericho. Here Meek adopts Professor Garstang's dating for the Fall of Jericho (about 1407 B. C.), but he disassociates Joshua from Moses by making him Moses' predecessor by two centuries! Others of the twelve tribes are held to have occupied northern Canaan in obscure movements independently of the two invasions already described. Through the leadership of Judah an amphictyony of the tribes was gradually formed after the time of Deborah. By Judah's leadership the worship of Judah's God, Yahweh, was adopted by the Joseph and other northern tribes. The unification of the national religion was virtually complete by the time of David, but was broken soon after. In the schism led by Jeroboam the northern tribes lapsed into their ancestral religion of bull or calf worship, which Meek traces back to the desert period of the northern Hebrews.

Perhaps the most radical reconstruction attempted by Professor Meek of Hebrew history lies not in this positing of separate origins for the northern and southern tribes, but in the further hypothesis that each of the tribes originally had its own god and that Yahweh (Jehovah) was at first the god of Judah only. Judah's faith, however, is admitted to be pre-Mosaic (p. 116). Levi adopted Judah's immemorial faith in the Egyptian period. The other tribes did not become Yahweh worshipers until after the settlement of Judah in the south of Canaan. Even Deborah is thought not to have worshiped him, her song in Judges 5 being attributed to a later Yahwist poet on some slender archaeological evidence!

Our author leaves it a doubtful question as to how closely, if at all, the tribes were related to one another by kinship. He reminds us that the word "Hebrew" was not originally an ethnic term but an appellative. At the same time he overlooks

the ethnic value of the name "Israel," which has archaeological corroboration in the Mosaic age (the stele of Merneptah). At any rate, in Meek's view, a common descent and a common faith derived from the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is not to be thought of. The whole patriarchal period has little significance for the origin of either the people or the religion. In this Meek differs sharply from more conservative authorities like W. F. Albright and from many earlier writers on the history of Hebrew religion like the Lutheran Eduard Koenig.

The historian of religion can never hope to avoid coming to grips with theology. Professor Meek's attitude to questions of Old Testament theology is consistently naturalistic and this influences his historical thinking more than he realizes. He does not discount revelation. He simply ignores it as a historical factor. The logical impasse which he thus reaches is obvious. There may be and there are many religions without a historic revelation. But a revelation from the living God occurring through stages of a people's history cannot have taken place without a responding and a corresponding religion. Is the Hebrew religion such a response or is it not? Professor Meek not only fails to answer this question. He fails to ask it! Instead, he carefully traces the origin of the Hebrews' God to the Arabian borderline between Canaan and the Sinaitic peninsula, where Yahweh is held to have been originally a local storm god. The calm, clear vision of father Abraham, gazing at the stars over Palestine and hearing the voice of everlasting promise, has nothing, after all, to do with Hebrew origins. Neither has the voice of one who said, "Before Abraham was, I AM."

When our author comes to treat of Hebrew prophecy he reaches a slightly higher appreciation of the factor of revelation. He writes (p. 178), "The prophets were not ordinary folk. . . . The prophets were religious geniuses and cannot be explained by the psychology of the ordinary

man." "There is nothing to prove that Hebrew prophecy owed much to that of other lands" (p. 182). On p. 183 he quotes approvingly from Gressmann, who wrote in conclusion of a lifetime of research, "If anywhere, the originality of Israel attains its most striking expression in prophecy. . . . Higher than the Tower of Babel towered Mount Zion." At his best, however, Meek sees in Hebrew prophecy not revelation but only a lofty human "religious genius" or "religious insight." On one page (177) he alludes to Jeremiah as having felt impelled throughout his lifetime by a force outside himself against which he was utterly powerless. Even so, Meek regards the experience as "mystic," or "ecstatic," and does not commit himself to revelation as a historical phenomenon.

It is in harmony with this non-committal theological position and its negative implications that Meek in his last chapter repudiates any notion of an original monotheism behind the Hebrew tradition, such as is indicated in the Noachic covenant of Genesis 9. For him the history of Hebrew religion, as of other religions, begins in a primitive polytheism, containing within itself certain monotheistic tendencies. At this point he enters into controversy with the eminent Roman Catholic anthropologist, Wilhelm Schmidt, whose great work, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, appeared in six volumes in 1926-1937.

While much of Professor Meek's interpretation of Biblical data will seem strained and hypothetical in the extreme to Lutheran readers, it is a pleasure to note that his bibliographical references include repeated citations from articles in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* and from the work of American Lutheran Old Testament scholars (Professors Creager, Alleman, and Flack). He is well acquainted also with the Danish Lutheran Old Testament authorities, A. Bentzen and J. Pedersen, and he quotes from the Swedish Engnell. Unfortunately he makes no use of the indispensable *Theologie des Alten Testaments* of Walter Eichrodt.

This book is well indexed. Of the three indices, the Scripture Index alone runs to seven and one-half pages in double column. There are many hundreds of bibliographical references in the footnotes, and these include books which appeared in 1950.

In conclusion let it be said that the positions maintained in *Hebrew Origins*, while radical in certain respects, are not those of an irresponsible theorist. The author has great respect for facts and for the historical method. In the course of his discussions he calls attention to many features in our Biblical sources which have been hitherto overlooked, and which certainly call for the kind of fresh study which he tries to give them. It is by patient investigation of the problems which he has opened up that further progress in Old Testament science will be made.

WILLIAM H. COOPER

The Dead Sea Scrolls. An N.B.C. Radio Discussion by E. C. Colwell, C. H. Kraeling, and M. M. Parvis. No. 661 (Nov. 26, 1950) of the University of Chicago Round Table. 16 pages. Paper, 10 cents.

An informative discussion is here offered not only concerning the Old Testament manuscripts found in Palestine in 1947 but also concerning the importance of Biblical manuscripts in general and the plan to prepare a new edition of the manuscript evidence for the text of the New Testament.

Moses, Who First Saw Our Pyramid of Life. By A. A. Williamson. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. 231 pages. \$4.75.

The author represents much more of the contents of the Pentateuch as actually Mosaic in origin than most modern scholars do. But Moses himself would scarcely recognize the "Moses" here depicted—who is largely the mouthpiece for Williamson's own ideas.

According to this book, Moses had no intercourse with God and received no revelations; he communed with himself and debated conflicting considerations until he reached conclusions. In fact, he had practically no faith in God—he merely used the God-idea to arouse the enthusiasm of the Hebrews and win their allegiance to his plan. And what was that plan? It is a long story.

When Moses fled from Egypt and had a complete change in manner of living, he faced with new vividness the problem of food. He realized that the carnivorous animals live on the herbivorous, and they live on vegetation. This dependence on lower orders determines the later evolutionary appearance of the higher orders of life. (The "allegory" of the Flood was composed to teach this, for only when the dove brought back a leaf could the creatures in the Ark go forth.) Moses' first great insight was that the fundamental fire of LIFE is in vegetation (this was the "revelation" at the Burning Bush).

There is competition between carnivores and herbivores (this is the significance of the "allegory" of Cain and Abel). Now one carnivore must eat dozens of herbivores, and they must eat millions of vegetable units. This is the "pyramid of life." When Moses comprehended this, he saw also that, conversely, a plant dominates a small spot of space, a herbivore dominates a much larger area, and a carnivore a still greater area; this is important.

From this, Moses' thought went on beyond the biological to the social. Man is the highest carnivore, and has dominion over the others and over the herbivores and vegetation. But this vast dominion is more than individual; here nations come into the picture. Then Moses went on to reason that a nation is a living entity, a true organism in fact and not only by analogy; and that in this realm, too, there is a pyramid of life; and that the logic of it leads on to supranational entities. Hence Moses got the vision of

building such a higher entity. (The "allegory" of the Tower of Babel expresses this vision of a humanity-wide society that man should achieve—but a narrow-minded "God" opposed it.) This is the way to peace and prosperity.

Moses wanted to share this ideal and to work toward its accomplishment. But in no existing nation could it be embodied. Therefore he finally determined to deliver the Hebrew slaves from Egypt, so he could build them into a nation embodying his vision, and from them it could spread to the world. By largely inventing a story of Abraham and a Promised Land, he won their cooperation; and by magic tricks (which later legend magnified) he bamboozled Pharaoh and got away. He cared nothing about the Hebrews themselves, and when they became obstreperous in the Wilderness he was more than once on the verge of abandoning them and trying some other group as the means of realizing his vision—for that was all that mattered. The vision included a considerable degree of democracy (an idea that other and sounder writers have found in Moses). And the system of laws he ordained was in many ways well designed to secure the noble goals at which he aimed.

But actually the plan failed—partly because of Moses' blunders in handling the practical problems of leadership, partly because the people never caught his vision. Nevertheless his message was handed down, though not understood. And when Jesus came, he took it up. Jesus was through and through a disciple of Moses and tried to bring his vision to realization. (The "Father" of whom Jesus spoke was the Hebrew national organism, which spiritually fostered him.) It was Paul who made Jesus into the god (sic; not God) of another religion. And religion must be superseded by science (*a la* Comte); Moses himself was "the Seer of Secularism!"

Finally the grand plan for internationalism is set in relationship with "emergent" evolution. In all this, the author seeks to

furnish for democracy a solid foundation in the principles of life. His sociological ideas deserve consideration, apart from the "Biblical" framework in which they are presented.

HAROLD L. CREAGER

Esther. By Norah Lofts. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 163 pages. \$2.50.

Mrs. Lofts' short novel improves upon the Biblical *Esther*. The chauvinist spirit of that Book is replaced by one of simple piety. The story ends happily with the Jews' deliverance from the intended Persian pogrom, and says nothing of their revenge and the institution of the Feast of Purim. Of course, this must not be taken as an attempt at Biblical exegesis. The story of *Esther* has here become the literary property of Norah Lofts (p. 163), and has nothing to do with Holy Scripture or the problems of its interpretation.

Hence there seems to be little point in discussing whether (with Hoschander and Mrs. Lofts) the Biblical Ahasuerus is to be identified as Artaxerxes II (404-359 B. C.) or (with the majority of scholars) as Xerxes (485-465 B. C.). Similarly, the bringing of God's name into the story, as in the apocryphal chapters, is here a liberty one may allow to the novelist, even though it raises a theological question from which the student of the Bible cannot so easily escape.

A book like this is pleasant reading. It may even serve to send one back from mental relaxation to hard study in the Bible. Would that more of our pastors might find increasing opportunity for both!

CHARLES M. COOPER

A Life of Jesus. By Edgar J. Goodspeed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 248 pages. \$3.00.

When a great scholar who has spent a life time in critical study of the New Testament undertakes to write a *Life of Jesus*, it is indicative of the challenge

which the story of Jesus presents both to the scholar and to the layman. The four gospel accounts invite every student to present a new interpretation of the strange story of Jesus' ministry. To be sure, as Dr. Goodspeed admits, no complete biography of Jesus can now be written. The sources are not complete for this purpose, and it seems to many that it is impossible to explain his life within the framework of human categories.

Dr. Goodspeed writes the story in simple and charming language that reflects his deep devotion to him who is the Master of men. Even though his critical views of the gospel material are everywhere apparent, the gospel portrait of Jesus is quite faithfully reproduced. That Jesus performed remarkable deeds, such as healings, exorcisms, and other acts of power, is acknowledged, even though some of the stories, like the feeding of the five thousand, are explained along different lines. The outline of the life of Jesus is patterned after the gospel of Mark.

Dr. Goodspeed has brought out very prominently the opposition to Jesus which forced him to avoid publicity and to seek refuge outside of the jurisdiction of Herod. He discouraged his followers from making him known and frequently withdrew from the centers of population in Galilee. During these periods of retirement he concentrated on teaching his disciples. It would seem, therefore, that the idea of "the Messianic secret" was not a construction of Mark, but an actual historical fact. It also would indicate that the teaching and actions of Jesus were so radical that the contemporary religious leaders determined to have him arrested and put out of the way. The controversies reported in the gospels are not, therefore, reflections of a later struggle between the church and the synagogue, but belong properly in the ministry of Jesus himself.

Dr. Goodspeed's interpretation of the resurrection involves a distinction between the Pharisaic idea of "a physical reanimation" and a spiritual presence as expressed

by Paul and John. It seems to me that Dr. Goodspeed weakens this idea of the spiritual presence by his reference to "the sense of their living presence" with us of our own beloved who have passed away. The followers of Jesus, including Paul and John, have had a much more realistic sense of the presence of the living Christ who is still active to seek and to save and to bring them into communion with himself.

This "Life of Jesus" is a wonderfully rich account, beautifully written, devotional, and full of suggestions for the interpreter of the gospels. But the picture of Jesus seems somehow to fall short of that presented in the original gospels. Perhaps the historian has gone here as far as he can possibly go in presenting a life of Jesus. Even though it is written, as the author confesses in the preface, with emotion and convictions, the individual believer will go further than this. After reading this book he will still find his faith expressed more adequately in the words of Paul, "Jesus is Lord," or in the words of Thomas, "My Lord and my God."

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

Das Vaterunser. By Ernst Lohmeyer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946. 216 pages.

The Lord's Prayer is the gospel in miniature, and each generation has to search the Scriptures anew in order to pray it fully. This is what Lohmeyer has done for us. He studies each petition in detail: the Greek text and its meaning, phrase by phrase and word by word; the historical relation to the Old Testament and later Jewish prayers, together with occasional comparison with the Gentile prayers of the period; the history of its interpretation and use in the church; and its application to life in our own troubled world. These studies, based on Matthew's form of the Prayer plus the later Doxology, are followed by a chapter on Luke's form. Luke's is not regarded as an

abridgement of Matthew's, nor Matthew's as a liturgical expansion of Luke's, but both as variants in use in different churches; and similarly for the reflections of the Prayer in the Gospel of John. On the question of hypothetical retranslations into Aramaic he is duly cautious, preferring to stick with the Greek text as our earliest attainable interpretation. His book is carefully documented, logically developed, and artistically arranged.

Lohmeyer divides the Prayer symmetrically into two parts of three petitions each. He relates the first part solely to God in heaven (his Name, his kingdom, his will), the second to the plight of man on earth (in debt, tempted, beset by Satan). Then he interprets the petition for bread as the core of the Prayer and the link between its parts. "Eschatological" is the key word to understand his approach and conclusions.

This means that God's kingdom is not regarded as the fulfillment of the Old Testament promises in the sense that God is working in man and with man to establish it within history, but as an entirely new order of life to be introduced solely by God himself. And yet, although it is thus severed from the historical process, it is expected to fulfill God's original aim in Creation, which has been thwarted by Satan and sin. From this point of view the gospel consists in the good news that God has already begun this eschatological work, thus revealing with finality his eschatological Fatherhood through Christ.

Christ's followers, as they pray this Prayer, constitute themselves as an eschatological brotherhood bound by the ties of forgiving love to their Father in heaven and to each other on an earth which continues under the power of Satan, despite the fact that Christ has broken his power in principle. While they wait for God's final eschatological act, they need and desire only the barest minimum of material goods. For them, God's grace-gift of a loaf made of wheat or barley, while necessary, is far more important

as the sign and proof of his love, which has invited them to his eschatological banquet. Lohmeyer would not expand this petition as Luther does in his Small Catechism to include all things necessary for our earthly life, but would pray it this way: "Give us this day our future (eschatological) bread."

Similarly, according to this interpretation, we pray for the eschatological forgiveness once for all, rather than for a forgiveness that has to be repeated daily while we wait for the End; but in being forgiven we forgive *our* debtors and thus participate in God's preliminary eschatological work here and now. The temptations from which this prayer guards us are no ordinary temptations but are dangers and woes intensified by the approach of the eschatological Morning. And the evil from which we pray to be delivered is not impersonal but the Evil One—the Devil himself—whose power and rage increase with the approach of the End.

Thus Lohmeyer sets all the petitions into an eschatological framework, which he regards as the only interpretation capable of bringing out their deepest spiritual implications. From this standpoint he criticizes the interpretations of Origen, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Harnack, and others. As he sees it, in the light of this new eschatological bond between the Father in heaven and his children on earth, all historical ties have ceased and fall away—blood and soil, fame and glory, sadness and need. Religious interest is transferred from the historical yesterday to the eschatological tomorrow, and today has significance not as contributing to that tomorrow, but only because it furnishes the first installment of the perfect eschatological inheritance.

Reading this book brings one a sense of closeness to God and to one's brothers in Christ. For, as Lohmeyer observes, God's holiness, which is commonly thought to be the principle that separates him from man, is in reality that in him

which binds him to us. The difference is that, whereas God *is* holy, man has to *become* holy. That is God's goal for man and man's unending task.

There is, however, a question whether this eschatological framework is in danger of becoming a straitjacket for the social dynamics of the Christian gospel. Lohmeyer concludes that the first petition does not mean that *we* do anything to hallow God's Name, or even that it *be* hallowed "bei uns," as Luther said, but simply that *God* may hallow it once for all with eschatological finality. Again, he tells us not to think of being co-workers with God to build God's kingdom; for as the sun rises and shines impartially on the good and the bad, so God's kingdom will come on his eschatological morning regardless of human prayers and fears and hopes, simply in response to his second and final "Let there be light." And although he recognizes that "Thy will be done" is not a passive or Stoic resignation to what cannot be helped, he goes on to reject the view of Tertullian and Augustine that it is a prayer to bring forth the fruit of holy living, in loving obedience to our heavenly Father.

By this he does not mean, of course, that the members of the eschatological fellowship which is thus constituted by believers as they pray this prayer do not hallow God's Name, live in his kingdom, and do his will; but he does insist that these first three petitions pray only for what concerns God and his doing, and not for man's actions and reactions. He holds that the aorist tense in these petitions implies a once-for-all finality that is incompatible with human efforts, which have to be repeated again and again. When it comes to doing, he says, there are just two things for the eschatological fellowship to do: pray and forgive.

But as Lohmeyer himself recognizes, there are implications in Luke's version of the Prayer which stick out from this eschatological framework like corners of a square superimposed on a circle. Even

in Matthew, to say nothing of Mark, there is evidence that Jesus' conception of the kingdom was not only subjective and other-worldly, but had more to do with the politics and economics of this world than the eschatological interpreters are wont to admit. Lohmeyer's aim and method have been, first to set forth the Biblical data, and then to draw his conclusions from the facts thus brought to light. But these data are not such that one can always determine the facts apart from the world-view (call it either philosophy or theology) with which one approaches them, much as one may try to do so.

Now a man's world-view is not unaffected by his social, political, and economic environment and cultural tradition. In the present period of disillusionment and persecution, when the Marxian revolutionists would like nothing so much as to silence the conscience voiced by the church, and to destroy Christianity by isolating it from social and political life, we have to guard more than ever against the temptation to take too easy comfort from eschatology. Rightly we reject the footless belief of the early Nineteen Hundreds in an inevitable evolution within history toward the kingdom of God. But this makes it all the more important not to fall into the same fatalism by expecting an eschatological act of God which will neither use nor conserve in that kingdom the best social efforts of men.

If hallowing God's Name, doing his will, and building his kingdom were a matter of celestial mechanics and spiritual robots, it might be true to say that these petitions refer solely to God and his doing. But, as long as our Creator grants us a modicum of freedom, our response and cooperation are involved in his answer. And if, as Lohmeyer says, our forgiving our debtors is part of God's *eschatological* action, it is hard to see why the same should not be true of all the petitions in our Prayer. Praying and forgiving are indeed fundamental, but there

are other aspects of Christian living that can be neglected or underemphasized only at our individual and collective peril.

To interpret the Christian life as one to be lived in an eschatological no-man's land during an indefinitely prolonged interim, in which history has nothing essential to do with the coming of the kingdom, is not to clarify but to confuse the exposition of the Lord's Prayer with an eschatological mysticism that clouds the simplicity of Jesus' teaching. There is danger that it will take the zest out of Christian action by conceiving the Christian task as imposed arbitrarily and only for the good of the soul of the individual while he waits for the eschatological morning when all of man's achievements in history shall count for nothing. If our political, social, and economic life does not fall within the scope of this Prayer directly and in a far more vital sense than some of our eschatologists recognize, we have no satisfying explanation of why God did not put us into his eschatological kingdom in the first place and dispense with the agony of history.

While remembering that Jesus in his parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven did not contemplate a long period of evolution, we shall do better to keep hold of the concept of growth toward the kingdom within history, in which we can, if we will, make a contribution that will be conserved for eternity. In thus extending the range of the Prayer, we can still retain all the spiritual values which Lohmeyer derives from his eschatological theory. Fidelity to the gospel as Jesus preached it does not require us to sever the kingdom of God from history. If God can use our forgiveness of our debtors as part of his eschatological work, there is no reason to suppose that we are not called to work with him in building his kingdom on earth as it is in heaven.

RAYMOND T. STAMM

The Apostle Paul. His Life and Work.

By Olaf Edvard Moe. Translated by L. A. Vigness. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. 577 pages. \$4.75.

Although a new book in English, this work belongs to that vague grouping of literature known as "older books," having first seen the light of day in Norway in 1923. The fact that it was written over twenty-five years ago need in no way detract from the quality of the work. Yet, the possibility of its permanency is not unrelated to the author's own time and setting of the problem of his research, which in a large way determines the intellectual structure of his exposition.

This book does not aim to present a novel thesis, neither does it attempt to introduce some new category of thought by which to get at the root of Pauline studies. Its author is professor of New Testament exegesis at the Independent Theological Seminary in Oslo, Norway. His writing is characterized by a fervent evangelical spirit and motivated by the conviction that "a constantly renewed penetration into Paul's life and doctrine will always continue to be a vital necessity for the evangelical church, which can remain alive only by the virtue of sources from which it originated." Fidelity to the New Testament sources is the basic principle to which the author adheres. The purpose of his work is not devotional but scientific, *wissenschaftlich* in the German sense of the word. "The book has a completely scientific basis. . . . This volume chiefly signifies a summation of the more commonly accepted results of Pauline research. . . . Here and there I maintain interpretations for which I myself must be held responsible."

But it is precisely here, on the "scientific" side of the work, where certain problems of profound import arise. The questions raised and answered are those which appeared in the context of the exegetical discussions of the late nine-

teenth century and of the early twentieth. The starting point, then, is determined by these particular circumstances. Since the author's intention is to provide a summation of the generally accepted results of Pauline scholarship, it is inevitable that a certain limitation of procedure follows. Phrases such as these appear often: "to date," "nearly all research workers," "recent investigators," "criticism is inclined to assume," etc. There prevails, too, a notion of the role of research which seems too fixed, almost axiomatic, as if it were of itself the final court of appeal. The inner dynamics within the world of scholarship remain unrecognized; there is hardly any awareness of the presuppositions, both philosophic and historical, which underlie the various types of interpretation of the New Testament. The time has come to wrestle seriously and unyieldingly with the problem of methodology in our Protestant Biblical research. To ignore this basic task is to fall ever more deeply into the mire of arbitrary subjectivism (it makes little difference whether it is of the intellectual or of the pietistic brand).

The author displays an open mind toward the critical historical problems facing the Pauline student. Yet, it becomes clear that an openness of mind in itself does not guarantee an adequate recognition of the scope and the complexity of the historical problems. Two instances suffice. The assertion that the "Acts and the Pauline letters, though they are independent of each other, yet supplement and reciprocally confirm each other" is an over-simplification of the relationship between these two sources, especially so in terms of the argument which mainly concerns Paul's attitude toward Judaism as reflected in them. The author also holds the bold view that Paul was set free from protective custody in Rome and that he journeyed to Spain, and again to the east, until finally arrested and returned to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom. The extra-Biblical sources sup-

porting this theory are referred to but not discussed critically.

This work, though falling short on the "scientific" side, deserves a place among the standard works on the life of Paul. With studied thoroughness and clarity of expression the manifold details and problems of Paul's life unfold to the reader. Paul's theology, however, is not considered since the author has it in mind to issue a special study of this subject later.

The author's conception of Paul can best be given in his own words at the close of the introduction: "Paul is not only a theologian; he is first and foremost a missionary, the greatest foreign missionary of all time." (Perhaps an interpolation is in order here. Paul himself was not conscious of being a "foreign missionary"; to call him that is to impose a modern conception upon his ministry. The true profundity of Paul's missionary calling can be easily obscured by the use of this expression.) "Pauline theology is only a link in his great missionary work. When, therefore, we wish to understand Paul the *theologian* we must begin with Paul the *missionary*. This is the way we will here try to follow. Within the framework of the delineation of his life-work, we shall endeavor to ascertain the presuppositions and motives of his apostolic calling. . . ."

JACOB W. HEIKKINEN

Explanation of the Book of Revelation.

By C. H. Little. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 232 pages. \$2.75.

In times of world distress commentaries on the Revelation of John find ready readers. It is a book designed to bring comfort and hope to devout souls under the strain and stress of war, political upheavals, social and economic changes, and religious persecution. Numerous fresh studies of the book have appeared in recent decades. Some of these have been

sectarian and confusing; others, evangelical and constructive.

Dr. Little, who has been a devoted student of the Scriptures and who for many decades taught courses in the Biblical field in Waterloo Seminary, has prepared a very conservative, lucid, and helpful volume explaining, chapter by chapter, the message of the Apocalypse.

Following the traditional view, the author regards the Revelation as the work of the Apostle John and divides it into its two parts: I. The Seven Epistles to the Churches in Asia Minor (1:9-3:22), II. Revelation Concerning the Consummation of God's Kingdom (Chapters 4 to 22).

His method of interpretation is in keeping with what is usually designated as the continuous-historical method, which he defines as that which "looks upon the prophecies as being progressively fulfilled during the history of the present dispensation." He considers this method to be "the one adopted by the vast majority of Protestant commentators" (p. vi). Thus he disregards the contemporary-historical approach as well as the futuristic.

In general, Dr. Little is consistent in his approach. He passes over the historical situation in the days of Domitian which called forth the Apocalypse and searches for the symbolical significance of the patterns in the present dispensation. He makes no mention of Rome as persecuting Christians in John's day, but refers repeatedly to "the antichristian powers." In his judgment, the number of the beast, "666," "does not refer to any one individual, but to the world-wide opposition to God and His cause. . ." (p. 138). "Gog and Magog stand as representatives of all opposition to Christianity and the Christian church, such as New Theology, New Thought, Mormonism, Russellism, Christian Science, and other radical sects . . ." (p. 208).

What one misses in the commentary is definite reference to the historical milieu. Most students of the Revelation today

recognize the significance of both the historical and apocalyptic approaches. Recent studies in apocalyptic literature have thrown floods of light upon John's Apocalypse. Patterns of Antiochus Epiphanes and the brief period of his persecution of God's faithful people reappear in the times of Domitian. But Dr. Little makes no reference to apocalyptic, as if it had no significance for the interpretation of the Revelation.

Lacking also in the work are both an adequate introduction and an index. A discussion of such matters as the date, canonicity, and general background of the Revelation would be helpful to the reader. Likewise, an index always adds to the value of a volume.

But in spite of these weaknesses, the commentary is a worthwhile work. Prepared with carefully-chosen words, printed with clear type, and attractively bound, the book reflects credit on both author and publisher.

E. E. FLACK

Saints without Halos. By Alvin E. Magary. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 176 pages. \$2.00.

As a pastor, writing to help laymen to know more intimately the people of the New Testament, the author is concerned to get behind the theological and ecclesiastical adornments of "saints" in order to reveal their "simple human reality as the common people of God." He purports to present an uncritical, practical reading of the writings of the New Testament as documents written by and to and for people "whose needs and aspirations, troubles and triumphs, sins and virtues are the same as today."

His list of "saints without halos" is a long one, and the individual jewels are strung together rather loosely. It includes "the disreputable" who are the prostitutes and the Jewish hirelings of Romans; Paul, who is characterized in one chapter as "a middle-aged failure" and in another

as "preacher at the prize-fight"; Luke, "the doctor who tells a story" and also "the first New Testament critic"; the Twelve who are seen as "saintly wranglers"; Peter as "the man who meant well"; Judas as the saint who embarrassed his Messiah; Nicodemus and John Mark who show forth "the courage of the coward"; Timothy who, by virtue of a quite uncritical reading of the Pastorals, becomes "the backsliding missionary"; James as "the downright brother of Jesus"; the Good Samaritan who is seen as "the great humanitarian."

In addition to these the mantle of sainthood is thrown over "the down-trodden sex," the women of the times, presumably all of them; "the friendly Romans" whose attempts to aid the gospel at every turn have never been fully appreciated; the "hyphenated Hebrews," i.e. the Hellenistic Jews; the Pharisees, "the defenders of the faith" who were saints whose goodness had gone sour, but who like the later Puritans "saved Israel even as the latter saved England"; and even "the bundle of letters" which is to be found in the New Testament canon.

The most amazing saint of all is Pilate, who is gloriously white-washed. All the favorable gospel references are accepted at their face value. The rather obvious tendency of the gospels to labor to make Christianity politically palatable to Roman officials is belittled. In fact, Jesus is himself partly responsible for his death in that he would not cooperate when the Roman governor sought to find ways to free him.

It is a good thing to put the most charitable construction upon the actions of others, while they are alive; and admirable to defend their memory against a false and unfair reputation. But it is neither historically accurate nor spiritually helpful to leave the impression, as this book does, that all the characters who cross the pages of the New Testament are "saints without halos." One wonders—were there no sinners, no un-

believers? How could this vast company of saints bring so much evil upon the world?

This book illustrates the basic weakness and danger of a presentation that does not feel it proper to trouble itself with critical problems and regards "higher criticism" as a "stupidity of scholarship." Its judgments are homiletical rather than historical. Its picture of humanity is interesting and accurate in its details, but superficial in its grasp. The book is not well organized. One reads and reads, waiting for the point to come—but it never does.

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER

Here I Stand. A Life of Martin Luther.

By Roland H. Bainton. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 422 pages. \$4.75.

Of the making of Luther books there appears to be no end. Recent years have beheld a perfect spate of them. This makes the adjective "definitive," which the publishers have applied to the present volume, appear not a little bold. No, Professor Bainton's life of Luther is not definitive, but it is, nevertheless, a very handsome achievement, ranking with Preserved Smith's volume and Boehmer's books for readableness. The author is steeped in his subject and its background and so moves freely in the sixteenth century environment with an admirable mastery of the whole complex of religious, ecclesiastical, social, intellectual, and political factors that are involved. He has, besides, an excellent gift of narrative; the story moves along as it should, gaining interest as it progresses, making the reader feel that he is going somewhere.

The style is untechnical, colloquial, not scorning an occasional bit of slang, yet always serious and wonderfully compact. The easy-flowing story conceals a great fund of varied learning and ripe judgment. Best of all, the author really gets down into the depths of Luther's experi-

ence of faith, and one senses his true spiritual kinship with the great soul he loves and has sought so hard to understand and to make known to his readers.

Since the book aims to set forth principally Luther's significance as revealed through the development of his religious experience and its impact upon history, its stress does not fall upon dates and connected biography. It begins not with Luther's birth, but with his first inner crisis, his entrance into the monastery in 1505, follows through the great years in which his convictions matured so rapidly with their world-shaking events culminating in 1521, and then continues in brief, strikingly-named chapters to describe Luther as builder and provider of a new pattern of church, state, and society, a new constitution for the church, a new liturgy, and a new Scripture in the vernacular.

The old, well-known material, which indeed has perennial interest, is handled in an exceedingly fresh and interesting way. The author is objective, fair, and does not evade the responsibility of criticism. On the old moot points of Luther's conduct in the Peasants' War and in the matter of the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, more might have been said in Luther's favor. Luther's view of the sacraments would be more fully, and so more completely, stated by a Lutheran, though Professor Bainton refreshingly states that we should not call Luther's conception of the real presence "consubstantiation." That Luther, affected by his partial isolation through the ban of church and state and prematurely aged by ill-health, became, during the last sixteen years of his life, cranky, irritable, and often violent is true, yet this condition seems to your reviewer to have been brought a bit too much into the forefront and, coming toward the end of the book as it does, unduly to cloud the total picture. The portrayal of Luther's *Anfechtungen*, the terrific travail of a heroic soul, is deeply

moving, and strikes down into depths which we penetrate too rarely.

The life is greatly enriched by copious extracts from Luther's writings, translated with life and vigor, well carrying across his powerful, concrete, spiritually penetrating, inimitable style. In these the terrible fighter and the saint both find expression. A mightily pungent selection from the Table-Talk reveals a decidedly unmythical side of this marvelously complex figure. In the author's summing-up, called "The Measure of the Man," the statement that "the home was the only sphere of life which the Reformation profoundly affected" may be more than doubted and seems to be contradicted by what follows. For Luther's influence in the area of the church is very fairly though briefly assessed, with generous credit given for his originative influence on the varieties of Protestantism, on the English Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, and also on the reform of the Roman Catholic Church. But the stress falls upon what Luther did for religion, and in the last sentences of the book it rests where it should, upon the God-centered man who had found home through the grace of God in Jesus Christ his Saviour.

Scores of fascinating woodcuts and engravings—cartoons and lampoons, book, tract, and Bible pages, and portraits—adorn and enliven the text, a fine and enjoyable help to orienting the reader in the sixteenth century context. An imposing bibliography, eight or nine closely printed pages of it, reveals what lies behind the clear, fluent narrative which any intelligent person may enjoy while daunted by that apparatus of painful research. A small matter to take up space: several times the word "sectaries" is printed "secretaries." There is also a chronology to keep one straight. All good people should be thankful for this book and for the popularity it has already won.

PAUL H. ROTH

Luther and his Times. The Reformation from a New Perspective. By E. G. Schwiebert. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 892 pages. \$10.00.

Inasmuch as it is not immediately apparent, even from the extravagant blurbs of the publisher, what the "new perspective" of this book is, a clarification is desirable at the outset. Two elements of a "new perspective" may be discerned. The first is that Professor Schwiebert has attempted to elucidate the role which the University in Wittenberg played in the development and spread of the Reformation. On the basis of his unpublished doctoral dissertation he furnishes a detailed description of the university town, the academic buildings and campus, the faculty, students, and resources of the institution, and the curriculum which was progressively revised in keeping with the progress and emphases of the Reformation. In this area lies the major original contribution which the book makes to an understanding of Luther and the Reformation. The second element in the "new perspective" is the incorporation in the narrative of a report on and a digest of the fruits of recent (mostly before 1933) German research. In the treatment of Luther to 1521, for example, the author leans heavily on Scheel's *Martin Luther* and Boehmer's *Road to Reformation*, as everyone must. Here as elsewhere, however, Schwiebert has made diligent use of the scholarly introductions in the Weimar edition and of a multitude of monographic studies.

An unusual feature is the extensive historical background of medieval church and empire, which contributes to the bulk of the volume. Unfortunately these first three chapters are so pedestrian that they may discourage the reader and prevent him from going on. Interest is quickened, however, when the author gets to the Reformer himself and traces the familiar stages of Luther's break from Rome. Some old legends—the discovery of the

Bible in Erfurt, the *scala sancta* in Rome, the inkwell at the Wartburg, the story of Zwingli's "different spirit"—are despatched with meticulous care, but sometimes (for example, pp. 136-144) Schwiebert is reluctant to express an opinion of his own where experts disagree. The reconstruction of the Leipzig Debate is vivid and helpful. The Marburg Colloquy is handled with restraint and circumspection. The provision of clergymen for the emerging Lutheran Church is discussed more fully than is customary. There is an interesting attempt to translate Luther's salary and other income into modern equivalents—an exceedingly conjectural procedure at best—and it is not surprising that Schwiebert arrives at conclusions rather different from Preserved Smith's (See Smith and Gallinger, *Conversations with Luther*, p. 51). the later career of the Reformer is given deserved attention, and the discussion of Luther's death is especially welcome in view of the re-emergence of distorted accounts in new polemics of our day.

Since the two have appeared almost simultaneously, a comparison of Schwiebert's book with Professor Bainton's *Here I Stand* is inevitable. The former lacks the distinguished literary quality of the latter, does not make so much use of non-literary sources, and does not succeed so well in making Luther come alive. On the other hand, Schwiebert's book is more comprehensive in its coverage of the Reformer's environment and career, far richer in its citation of secondary as well as primary sources, and consequently more useful, on the whole, for reference purposes. Schwiebert's text is about twice the length of Bainton's. For this reason, as well as because it is more readable, Bainton's book will enjoy greater popularity. On the other hand, on account of its documented review of the present stage of some aspects of Luther research and on account of its material on the University in Wittenberg, Schwiebert's book will remain a useful tool for the serious

student of Luther and the Reformation for a long time to come.

The reader will be unnecessarily annoyed by some idiosyncrasies in Schwiebert's style. "Kaiser" is often, but not always, used instead of emperor. "Every eight days" is used for every week (114), *Bilderstuermer* for iconoclasts (540), *Gottesbegriff* for conception of God (689), the Latinization "excusation" for defense (388), the obsolete "courtesan" for courtier (191), "confession" for creed (170), "*Weckruf* of 1524" for Luther's tract "To the Councilmen of all Cities," etc. Such pedantry serves no useful purpose.

A thoughtful study of this book should stimulate the reader to ask questions and search further (preferably in Luther's own writings) for answers. It may be taken for granted that it was one of the author's intentions that his book should serve such a function. He ought to be disappointed, in fact, if his monumental work is taken so lightly that no questions are raised. Here are a few. Was it really Luther's intention to assert that the elements (of water or of bread and wine) become a sacrament "when combined with the words of institution" (pp. 448, 450)? Baptism is a covenant in the New Testament sense of the term, but is this the same as saying that it is "an agreement between God and sinful man" (448)? Was it Luther, or was it the Anabaptists, who wanted the church to "return to its early purity and practice" (8, 683)? It is quite relevant to point out, as Schwiebert does on occasion, that there is a deep gulf between Luther and the dogmatists of the seventeenth century, but is not the conception of *sola scriptura*, in the form in which it appears in the text again and again, the doctrinaire conception of the seventeenth century rather than Luther's?

Schwiebert is most exacting when he devotes himself to a reconstruction of Luther's career in the context of its external environment. And, as the title of

his book indicates, this is the task to which he has addressed himself. What he set out to do, he has done commendably well. Anyone who is at all interested in the subject will find a study of the book rewarding and will be grateful to Professor Schwiebert and to the publisher for an informative, useful, handsome and lavishly illustrated volume.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Monk in Armour. By Gladys H. Barr. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 256 pages. \$3.00.

Those of us who have recently read Bainton's *Here I Stand* and Schwiebert's *Luther and His Times*, and whose memory of Boehmer's *Road to Reformation* is still fresh, will read this historical novel based on the life of Luther with mixed reactions. Of the author's literary talent there can be little doubt. Her style is lively, her diction choice; her descriptions are vivid and her sense of the dramatic is evidenced again and again. The leading characters are sharply delineated and, in the main, one would say, agree fairly well with history. The underlying plot is suggested by the title of the book: Luther is the "monk in armour," who gets his inspiration from a painting by Albrecht Dürer, "The Knight, Death, and the Devil," which Luther sees on his way to Rome in a luxurious Benedictine Monastery in Italy. It inspires him with the courage of a medieval knight to go out and fight the evils of the church and to "proclaim God's truth to all people" (p. 85).

While the right of a fiction writer to take liberties with historical facts is generally recognized, one wonders whether the author has not occasionally allowed her imagination to roam a bit too far. This reviewer does not object to the fictitious interview between Luther and the Pope (whom Luther actually never got to see), nor to his personal conversations with Frederick the Wise (which really never happened), nor to the strange

appearance of the Italian Savonarola in a humble inn of the mining village of Mansfeld in Germany. But we do feel a rather severe strain on our credulity as we note the incredible speed with which, according to Mrs. Barr, Luther wrote his famous hymn "A Mighty Fortress" while traveling with several companions in a "jerky cart" on his way to Worms, then sang it at once to the tune that came to him on the spur of the moment, taught both words and tune to his companions and the military guard, so that they all sang it lustily together, over and over again, as they entered the city, where the crowds of admirers took it up and "the chorus grew louder and louder, until voices echoed clear above the city of Worms, resounding to the outskirts and to the rooms of the Emperor himself" (p. 173). And when she lets the young university student fall in love with Lady Frederika, the beautiful sister of his classmate, Count Gabriel, and then lets him struggle with that love as he becomes a monk and, even later, down to the very eve of his marriage to "Ketha," the author seems to carry her "poetic license" to a point where the historic picture of the great hero of the Reformation becomes seriously distorted. But, we admit, it all makes interesting reading.

P. H. BUEHRING

Luthers Lieder und Gedichte. By Wilhelm Stapel. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1950. 245 pages. DM 9.80.

The contents and forms of Reformation faith are foreign to the cultured class of the present day. Can the faith which once sang its way into a people's heart, and brought families and communities together with God, speak with validity to educated people today? Yes, and especially through Luther's hymns, insists the author of this fine little book. Does that mean that these hymns must be "modernized?" No, for then they would lose their power and massiveness. They must rather

be loved and understood upon their own background.

The author richly provides the means for understanding and loving Luther's hymns. He sketches the poetic activity of the Reformer and explains his place in German language and literature. When we understand Luther's position between the saga and meistersinger periods before him, and the baroque and modern periods following, we discover that irregularities of rhythm and rhyme in Luther's poems are not evidence of carelessness or mediocrity, but the characteristic style of the day.

Luther made no pretense of being a great poet. "He was no esthete, but a prophet." Yet he produced some great poetry. Its chief quality is its sturdy "lyrical architecture." Luther combined heart and mind, emotional dynamic and logical structure, in order to proclaim his religious message potently. To demonstrate this, Stapel casts a spotlight upon four features of Luther's poetic style: rhythm, rhyme, alliteration, and compactness.

Following this introduction, Luther's hymns are printed in full. With them appear six of his prefaces for various hymn-books and a collection of his German and Latin occasional verses. A generous commentary (111-245) elucidates archaic language and spellings, meter and content. Particularly valuable are the analyses of style, and the suggestions for reading aloud in order to capture the full force and flavor of the poetry. (Stapel repeatedly insists that the natural emphasis of words determines the rhythm in Luther's style.) In this respect the book opens up a fascinating field largely untouched in Schliesse's *Handbuch der Lutherlieder* and in Volume III of the Munich Edition of Luther's Works.

Typographical errors are few, and rarely distracting. Read "Rörer" for "Röder" or "Röver" (p. 145, 150), "Babst" for "Bast" (227), "haec" for "haet" (106). The evangelical martyrs

were Augustinians at Antwerp, not Brussels (197).

ROBERT H. FISCHER

Luther, den nya tidens genombrott och kris. By Hanns Lilje. Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 246 pages.

The leading publishing house in Sweden for church and religious literature here presents a new book on Luther, written by Bishop Hanns Lilje and translated into Swedish.

This book is not a biography of the Reformer. It is rather an analysis of the background and the inheritance of the Reformation. Lilje has divided his book into three main sections, The Background, The Deed, and The Inheritance. Actually only the section called "The Deed" is particularly concerned with Luther.

In the first section, "The Background," Lilje stresses the fact that Luther has to be seen as an instrument in God's guidance of history, and he rejects the usual question, What has Luther done? That Luther appeared just at the right moment is a mystery of history. That means that the question, What would have happened if Luther had not lived? is vain and not in place. The Reformation would have taken place even without Luther; as Lilje paradoxically states it, the Lutheran Church would have come into existence even if Luther had never lived.

In the section entitled "The Deed" we find the usual well-known biographical data about Luther, but in a subdivision of this section, called "The Birth of the Reformation," Lilje shows a definite inclination to interpret in modern philosophical terms the experience which became decisive in Luther's life. Lilje's interpretation of Luther's experience is very close to the existentialism of our day. Lilje says that the principal question in Luther's thoughts was whether he

could exist before God. Even if these existential questions already existed in earlier days, as Lilje affirms, it is nevertheless an entirely new approach to an understanding of Luther's experiences at the birth of the Reformation. Luther found the answer to this question in what is usually called "God's justification."

In the last section, "Inheritance," Lilje points out that Luther's experience of faith—that is, the experience of a single man—became the origin of an historical transformation in which we are still involved. Again in this section Lilje returns to his idea of existentialism when he says that Luther's thoughts about personality started with his understanding of the solitude of man before God in the moment of death. This leads to a definite rejection of individualism. The human being is no longer the master of his fate, but stands instead before the tremendous question of how, after all, he would be able to exist in this world. The Reformation's basic definition of faith is that God gives to man as a gift that life which he cannot live before God through his own power. A very interesting subdivision of this section is the chapter on the church. It would lead too far to mention all the details of this chapter, but it may be pointed out how Lilje interprets Luther's conception of the church. He says that where Jesus Christ is preached in faith and received in faith, there is the church. This statement leads him, of course, to the conclusion that the church of Christ is not limited to the Lutherans, a conclusion which in our day certainly has to be observed and stressed.

In the last chapter, "The Foundation of the New Age," Lilje deals extensively with the state and government, and anyone can feel that this chapter has been written under the influence of the experiences of dictatorial government in Germany and elsewhere. Lilje says that the Reformers clearly pointed out that the obedience of citizens is ethically bound and therefore is not to be con-

sidered as absolute, and Lilje says very explicitly that obedience has a limit.

OTTO NOTHHACKSBERGER

Les Églises en Allemagne. By Edmond Vermeil, K. J. Hahn, and Gabrielle Bras. Paris: Librairie Marcel Rivière et Cie., 1949. 118 pages. \$1.25.

These studies were prepared by the Netherlands Institute for International Affairs and have been discussed at numerous international conferences in many countries in Europe and America. The paper by Mr. Vermeil on the Lutheran Church is a critical indictment of Lutheranism, which by its original nature is to blame for Bismarckism, Prussianism, Naziism, and consequently for World War II. The other two papers make a strong case for the Roman Church as the one which alone can build a Christian culture in Germany, as it once did in the Holy Roman Empire.

Mr. Vermeil is honestly concerned about fitting Germany into the Western culture and the European community. The difficulty lies not only in the ecclesiastical dualism which divides Germany, but in the theological and ethical dualism of Lutheranism. The German mentality is an enigma, because in Lutheranism there is a divorce between individual morality and political activity, and the twain never meet. Follow Luther and your individual morality will have no application or relevance to the political world. The political, industrial, and military system which was Prussianism goes straight back to the Lutheran conception of the nature of the state and politics. This conception shows itself now in the Lutheran thinking which tries to escape all collective German responsibility for Naziism and the war. Luther's emphasis on the inner freedom of the soul naturally made him renounce all sovereignty over against the state. Result: indifference toward political and corporate life.

When the Counter-Reformation came, Lutheranism lost its original accent, its

popular savor, its genial spontaneity, and drifted at length into an unholy alliance with the Renaissance. Thus German Christianity became secularized. Lutheran individualism limited man's influence to the family; and the Lutheran-Prussian authoritarianism, as Troeltsch says, was destructive of all religious renewal and democratic action. Thus is established the Lutheran dualism: the inner kingdom of the soul, where the invisible church shuts itself up with the Christians, and the exterior kingdom, where men are governed and where brutality and Machiavellianism have free reign because of sin.

The Weimar Constitution left the churches as official corporations of the state, thus under the control of the state. Out of this could easily develop the myth of the German national religion, exploding finally into Naziism and the Third Reich with its racism, totalitarianism, and thus the liquidation of the Christian religion. This Third Reich was not invented by the Nazis. It was envisioned by Luther and grew out of his failure to understand the relation of personal religion to political life.

It is principally Niemöller who has called the German people and church to repentance for the World War II. Thielicke's criticism of the Stuttgart Declaration is another emergence of the "famous distinction between individual and collective morality." So the author again lays the blame for the whole business at the door of Martin Luther.

The two treatises on Catholicism by M. Hahn and M. leBras, in contrast to the one on the Lutheran Church, are fresh and effective presentations of the important role of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany today. The attempt to parallel Roman and Nazi totalitarianism is sharply refuted. The very heat of the Nazi attack on the Roman Church is the best evidence that there was no love lost between them. The Roman Church is frankly trying to build up again in Germany a Catholic culture like that in the

Middle Ages. They are doing it by concentrating on the youth. And here they are out in front. They are building in the religious, economic, and intellectual spheres, and are trying to give Germany a universal point of view instead of the narrow nationalistic. It is becoming evident that "in a dramatic moment of the life of the people the only universal and robust authority which remains is that of the Roman Catholic Church." The rebuilding of Germany means the rebuilding of Catholic power in Germany through education, Catholic conferences and congresses, and cooperation with non-German Catholicism.

HERMAN A. PREUS

Menschsein und Christsein bei Augustin, Luther und Jacob Burckhardt. By Walther von Loewenich. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1948. 132 pages. DM 4.

Three essays, prepared in recent years on various occasions, are here brought together under one cover. In all three the relationship between *humanitas* and *christianitas* is discussed. The ascetic Augustine tended to condemn natural life and to renounce all that belonged to it. He did so because of his profound sense of the reality of sin; yet he could say that everything that has been created is good. For Augustine being a man and being a Christian remained in an unresolved tension. Luther differed from Augustine in that he assumed a positive attitude toward natural life. But as his *De servo arbitrio* shows, he was far from sharing the humanists' glorification of man. On the other hand, the great nineteenth century historian of the Renaissance, Burckhardt, concerned himself especially with man and remained something of a religious skeptic. But he seemed to sense, as we have learned today at great cost, that man cannot realize his full manhood without Christianity. Being a Christian does not rule out being a man even if the relationship cannot be expressed in nice logical fashion.

These essays are intended to illuminate, not to solve, a problem. The thoughtful reader will find them full of suggestion for further reflection.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Herrnhutisk Teologi i Svensk Gestalt. Uppsala Universitets Årskrift 1949:8. By Gösta Hök. Uppsala: 1950. 207 pages.

Gösta Hök in 1948 brought out an excellent study of Zinzendorf under the title of *Zinzendorfs Begriff der Religion*, also in the Uppsala University Series. Now he has published a study of an important Herrnhut document in Sweden. Arvid Gradin, a Swedish minister's son, became an adherent of Zinzendorf in 1738, and on a trip to his native country in 1741-42 (the same year that Zinzendorf visited Pennsylvania) wrote a rather full statement of his new faith, entitling it (in translation) *The Secret of the Gospel and Christianity in regard to the atonement, redemption and salvation through the blood and death of the Incarnate God and through faith in Him*. This treatise was never published but circulated especially in southern and western Sweden, where it had great influence on the circles of pietists who also became the centers of the Herrnhut followers. Hök has carefully analyzed this document and shown both the agreements and divergences between Gradin and Zinzendorf. In general he finds that where the Swedish disciple differs from Zinzendorf it is in the direction of Wolfianism—Gradin allows for an illumination by the Word leading to conversion while Zinzendorf makes conversion more entirely a matter depending on the will of God even aside from the Word.

This is a welcome study in the story of Swedish Lutheranism. More than the descendants of the Scandinavian pietists are aware, their tradition includes a heritage from the Herrnhut brethren, for the revivals of the nineteenth century were not independent of the Zinzendorf move-

ment of the eighteenth century. Lutherans owe more to the various non-Lutheran streams of pietism than they have been willing to acknowledge.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Captain Jens Munk's Septentrionalis. By B. M. Hofrenning. Paper, 71 pages. Illustrated. Privately printed, author, 1342 Second Avenue S., Fargo, N. D. 75 cents.

Since knowledge of the Jens Munk expedition to Hudson Bay in 1619 and 1620 is limited, this little study, based on a variety of accounts in many languages, is welcome. At the present site of Churchill, Manitoba, Captain Munk, his crew, and the Lutheran clergyman Rasmus Jensen had their winter quarters. Here the first Lutheran services in North America were held, here most of the crew died, and here the pastor himself was buried. Munk's journal of the voyage, *Navigatio Septentrionalis*, is the major source of the study.

Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital.

By Luke Ebersole. New York: Macmillan Co., 1951. 195 pages. \$2.75.

The word "lobbying" has acquired unsavory connotations by its application to the activities of self-seeking pressure groups. Dr. Ebersole tries to redeem the word from disrepute by describing it as a normal and necessary part of the democratic process. "To be without group representation," he says, "is to be without a voice in an important phase of law-making. To have group representation is to lobby."

The purpose of the book is to give a factual description and an unbiased interpretation of the growing influence of religious groups in the Washington scene. The author, a professor of sociology at the University of Maryland, presents the information clearly and interprets the facts with considerable insight. His comparison of Protestant and Roman Cath-

olic methods of exerting influence on government shows real comprehension.

"Lobbying" as applied to church groups is used in this book in a generic sense. It includes the activities not only of church representatives who are registered as lobbyists and exert direct pressure on Congressmen, but also of those whose function is to keep church officials informed of government trends and to channel information about the churches and their work to key people in government. Thus the Washington public relations offices of the National Lutheran Council and of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod are included in the chapter entitled "Protestant Lobbies" although a description of their work indicates that it does not include lobbying in the usual sense.

Various methods of influencing government policy and action are explored. They include: watching legislative proceedings; making friends in Congress; helping to draft legislation; furnishing information to legislators; working with Congressional committees; exerting direct pressure on Congressmen; exerting indirect pressure through campaigns of popular protest or appeal; working with administrators of government agencies; making contacts with the White House; sponsoring conferences and seminars on current issues; and educating the general public in intelligent citizenship.

The legislative interests of churches are classified in three categories: (1) legislation on behalf of particular groups, such as displaced persons, refugees, Negroes, underprivileged children; (2) legislation on behalf of general human welfare, such as housing, health, education, European recovery; and (3) legislation in which the program and special concerns of the churches are involved, such as inclusion of lay employees in social security, distribution of surplus commodities, increase in postal rates.

The author points out that the churches have moved far beyond mere opposition

to "liquor, war, and sin." The trend is toward a positive Christian approach to social issues. With increasing centralization of government function, he predicts that church representation and influence in Washington will become increasingly articulate.

ROBERT E. VAN DEUSEN

Basic Christian Ethics. By Paul Ramsey.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,
1950. \$3.75.

The aim of the author is commendable: "to stand within the way the Bible views morality" (p. xi). He attains his purpose to a remarkable degree. His book is not surpassed by any extant text on Christian Ethics in English.

Prof. Ramsey admits that his book may "well be described as an essay in the Christo-centric ethics of the Reformation" (p. xiv). That again commends the book. The author chose for his slogan "obedient love." No century brought this truth out more clearly than the period of the Reformation. Yet the book is not merely a summary of New Testament and Reformation emphases. It is written for the modern man and deals forthrightly with the problems confronting him.

A glance at the chapter headings indicates the outline of the book. 1. The two Sources of Christian Love; 2. Christian Liberty: an Ethic without Rules; 3. The meaning of Christian Love; 4. Faith's Effectiveness; 5. Christian Vocation; 6. Christian Virtue; 7. The Work of Christian Love; 8. The Human Nature; 9. Christian Love in Search of a Social Policy; 10. The Religious Foundation for Community Life.

There are more quotations from the New Testament than from the Old Testament. That fact may seem unimportant in itself, but the author, unlike most of his predecessors, really succeeds in bringing forth a Christian ethic based on the New Testament. Most of his predecessors became entangled in the Law as a basis

of Ethics and found delight or sought refuge in the Old Testament Law.

The author leans heavily on St. Augustine and Martin Luther. Without exhausting the possibilities in the field of comparative ethics, Dr. Ramsey discusses the contrasts and connections between Christian ethics and Platonism, Aristotelianism, hedonism, humanism, and utilitarianism. Dr. Ramsey becomes a good guide for the students in theological seminaries. He is even a better guide to men who have overlooked or perhaps deliberately avoided the chief New Testament considerations.

If there is one criticism to be injected, it is this: the author is too sympathetic with the Augustinian-Lutheran-Kierkegaardian tradition, with the result that he fails properly to evaluate other traditions in Christian ethics. For sheer numerical support the Aristotelian-Thomist-Kantian influence in Christian ethics cannot be overlooked or minimized.

Those whose predilections are for philosophical ethics rather than for New Testament ethics may find much to criticize in this book. Those who are not sure of their New Testament teachings will have much to learn from it.

This reviewer thanks God for Ramsey's book and hopes it may become a standard text, or at least required reading, in any theological course bearing the name Christian Ethics.

EDWARD C. FENDT

The Gospel and Modern Thought. By Alan Richardson. London: Oxford University Press. 1950. 210 pages. \$2.00.

The jacket of this volume carries the information that it is designed "for thinking people knowing the importance of scientific fact and needing assurance that faith and theology can maintain their truth by scholarly standards." The author makes a good case for theology as a science, as a special and specific discipline, dealing with matters that belong to the realm of religion. He points out that we

are apt to regard as true science only those disciplines which in their investigations can arrive at "demonstrable results." This, however, is too narrow a definition of science, and to prove the point the author refers to the study of history which must also be regarded as a science even though it cannot establish its hypotheses by means of experiments. Wisdom and understanding can be gained from the pursuit of this science, but it cannot produce agreed and demonstrable results (p. 36).

Richardson defines Christian theology as "the scientific study of the phenomena presented by the existence of the Christian Church." In and by itself this definition may not seem to be satisfactory, but in its proper context it becomes meaningful and is thus seen to refer to all the experiences of the Christian life and the Christian community. As any other scientific discipline, theology "claims the right to develop its own method and to pursue its own researches unhampered by the enforced application of methods which are more appropriate in other fields" (p. 39). This observation is both valid and valuable in calling attention to a fallacy that is altogether too common in regarding theology as "unscientific" simply because it does not employ the same methods as the physical sciences nor arrive at demonstrable results.

In answer to the question, "How can I know God," it is stated that the mere fact that the question is asked shows that the person concerned already knows God. Qualities such as truth and beauty and our sense of a moral obligation not only bear witness to God but show that he is present in our lives (pp. 9-11). While this cannot be denied—for all good comes from God—it must also be added that this kind of knowledge is not sufficient unto salvation.

In the chapter entitled "The Trinity in Unity" we find a number of things that are noteworthy in connection with our approach to the doctrine of the Trinity.

This doctrine, so the author affirms, is not based on intellectual calculations but rather upon the acts of God within human history. Thus it has arisen from the life (experience) and worship of the Christian church (p. 138). As thus originating the doctrine concerning God as a Trinity in Unity has its real significance also for us within the realm of Christian life and worship.

To a number of readers the last two chapters of the volume here under review will no doubt appear as of less value than the foregoing parts of the book, while others, again, will consider these chapters quite unsatisfactory, and this rightly so since the author calls into question several ideas that have been generally accepted in Christian thinking. It is one thing, for instance, to admit that one does not know the entire meaning of the "original state" of man, but it is quite another to assert, as the author does, that "there is no longer any good reason to suppose that once in the past there lived a perfect Adam in a perfect paradise" (p. 166). In discussing the problem of evil the author seems to regard the existence of a personal evil power as a myth. "The devil has his uses in the moral sphere, but he is valueless as a philosophical solution of the problem of evil" (p. 189). True, the problem of evil is not solved in its entirety by a belief in a personal devil, yet there is also more truth involved in this connection than Richardson seems to be ready to admit in his reference to our "picture thinking about the devil" (p. 189).

In spite of the matters just referred to we believe that Dean Richardson has rendered a real service by giving us a book of this kind. It reads well, and it is quite evident that the author is seriously endeavoring to deal with some of the fundamental aspects of our Christian faith in their contemporary setting. Thinking people, clergy and laity alike, will benefit by reading this volume.

C. G. CARLFELT

A Firm Faith for Today. By Harold A. Bosley. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1950. 283 pages. \$3.00.

The author of this book is himself a man of "firm faith." His ministry has shown that; and the twelve chapters of this volume are further evidence of the same. Following his insistence that "For a man to proceed without a creed in religion is actually to proceed without any clear sense of where he is going or why he is going there," Dr. Bosley leaves no doubt that he is one of those who can say whole-heartedly, "We believe" in God, in Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit, in the Bible, in the Church, in Man, in the Forgiveness of Sin, in Reconciliation, in the Kingdom of God, in Salvation, and in Immortality. Here is an important testimony for such a time as this. And it is written with manifest learning, grace, fervor, and literary competency.

It would of course be evaluated differently by readers of differing theological outlooks. The author sets himself over against both "fundamentalists" and "neo-orthodox theologians." He accuses Reinhold Niebuhr of "espousal of what amounts to blind faith"—and is at a loss to understand that attitude on the part of "one of our greatest contemporary theologians." Bosley deplores the presentation of the Christian faith as "either antirational or suprarational." He affirms that his own "method of studying the problems and the manner of stating the conclusions are those of liberalism." He refuses to stand with "a theology that emphasizes 'faith' as superior to 'reason.'" He espouses an apologetic which bases faith on an examination of "facts." Accordingly, belief in God is a "conclusion . . . reached by the human mind." That God is love is "an inference." Indeed, love is a discernible "principle of progressive integration . . . in the universe." God is a "concrete principle . . . giving stability, definiteness, and creativity to the universe." And Christ is a "teacher" whose "world-stirring teachings stamp him one

of the greatest." In those teachings are "eternal truths." His "suggested answers are truer than any other answers that we know about."

Probably no phenomenon of religious thought, since Kant's rough-handling of the historic "proofs" of religion, is more striking than modern man's judgment that the "proofs" are not really the basis of religious faith. The most vigorous apologetic of today does not essay to come to faith in God by an inferential process. God's coming to man is itself that which brings man to faith; and reason's great—and undeniable—mission is to interpret and expound that which is antecedent to inference.

To one committed to the latter position, Bosley's inferences from "stubborn facts" will be something less than sufficient proof of a "firm faith for today." But two things ought to be said in this connection. For one thing, since he clearly espouses a faith based on open-minded examination of the facts, he will have access to many to whom a declaration of "the primacy of faith" would be foolishness and a stumbling-block. His book has a chance to be read by a goodly company whom any approach other than his would seem sure to alienate. And, in the second place, one who can, by the book's avowed intention to face all the facts, be brought to read it, may find through it much more than that which is inferentially derived. Indeed, one feels that the author's faith is itself bigger than his argumentation, that the reasons he presents did not lead him to his faith. His faith is antecedent to—and bigger than—his marshaling of the facts. "The experience of God is the primary fact." The Holy Spirit is "at work in the life of the person, of the world, and . . . the Christian community." "It is not enough for men to respect Jesus as a 'good man,' or a 'great teacher,' or a 'great prophet.' . . . Men must be able to say with Thomas, 'My Lord and my God.'" "Christ is God addressing us about all that really matters in life." As

to the Bible, "It is not enough for us to own it; we need to be owned by it." The author speaks with no uncertain voice as to the tragic reality of sin, the absolute nature of the distinction between right and wrong, the need for salvation, the indispensable place of the church, and the certainty of the life everlasting.

It is to be hoped that today's liberal will read this book, with its eloquent witness to a firm faith. And maybe the reading is no less important for the "neo-orthodox" (whatever that means!) as a timely warning against taking refuge in irrationality.

CARL C. RASMUSSEN

Praktisk Psykologi. By Gösta Nordquist. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1950. 155 pages.

This volume is an analysis of a number of attitudes in various psychological schools which lend themselves to practical application in the work of the pastor and the psychological consultant. The author uses illustrations from real life to illustrate his theory. Various psychological insights on the part of Freud, Bjerre, Adler, and others are described, and suggestions are offered as to the manner in which they may be applied in dealing with persons who may need help. Numerous suggestions are also given with respect to the manner in which they may be used in various personal relationships and in working with others. A splendid analysis of gestalt psychology is given. The author emphasizes that personality needs an integrating center and that difficulties develop when such integration is disturbed.

The disturbing and disrupting influence of the spirit of competition has often been described from the sociological point of view but seldom have I seen the personality disturbing effects of this spirit described from the psychological point of view. This the author does in a very interesting and convincing manner. Competition has never been recognized as a

Christian virtue, and now both sociology and psychology demonstrate that it is a source of conflict.

One very fruitful section of the book deals with the problem of discipline of children. From the point of view of the development of the children all harsh methods are to be avoided and obedience should be developed in a positive manner.

This is a volume which cannot be reviewed in detail because those details are too numerous. It is a book which cannot be read in a cursory manner but must be studied to be appropriated. The material is presented in a very fascinating style which holds the attention of the reader. The presentation itself bears the marks of the practical psychologist.

A. D. MATTSON

Oekumenischer Katechismus. By Wilhelm Menn. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1950. 64 pages.

This little booklet is described in the subtitle as "a brief instruction about the origin and nature of the ecumenical movement," prepared under the auspices of "the executive committee of the Christian Churches in Germany." It is intended not only for pastors, theological students, and Christian leaders generally, but for the many men and women in the congregations who are interested in the subject and in need of information. It answers sixty specific questions besides containing general information concerning the movement.

Kyrkohistoriska arkivet i Lund. By Hilding Pleijel. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. 16 pages. Kr. 1.

The great economic and social changes that have taken place in Sweden during the past century have naturally also affected the church. To preserve the records and knowledge of church life of the past, the Archives of Ecclesiastical History at Lund University was founded in 1942. The author of this pamphlet is the

originator and director of the institution. The Archives publishes from time to time reports on various topics, the result of special investigation. The present pamphlet describes its aims and activities.

Vårt Kyrko-År. By Sven Norrbrink. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelse, Förlag, 1950. 47 pages. Kr. 1.25.

This little booklet on "Our Church Year" aims to give in a brief form an explanation of the origin of the Church Year and the significance of the various seasons and holidays, intended for laymen and young people.

O. N. OLSON

Beside Still Waters. By William Gustave Polack. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 73 pages. \$1.25.

This is a little book of sermons by a distinguished professor of Church History. The author died just previous to their publication. His book breathes gentleness of spirit and quiet faith, and is essentially pastoral. The ten sermons were preached at a little chapel on the shores of Clear Lake, Indiana, where the author had a summer cottage. They are soundly grounded in the Word, though they would classify as topical sermons. Each sermon is keyed to the location by the lake and offers a spiritual analogy from the waters. One was expressly preached to comfort families bereaved by tragic drowning accidents on the lake. Illustrations are profuse and apt; quotations abound, particularly from the great hymns of the church; and vocabulary and sentence structure make for clarity.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

The Blind Spot in American Public Education. By Clyde Lemont Hay. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 110 pages. \$2.00.

Shall we call this book another cake of the yeast which so many men are

freely putting into the social baking? If the leaven works, our successors ought to have somewhat more tasty eating when they consume the results of our educational efforts.

Mr. Hay, now retired, was a Methodist pastor with educational interests which included many years of service in the general Sunday School work of his denomination. He also published a "church membership manual" for children.

The book contains several "recognitions": the necessity to make moral and religious education universal; the importance of making it an integral part of a unitary educational experience instead of something separate and optional; the inadequacy of the church program as to personnel and time; the illogical character of separating religion from the education provided by the state; the fact that putting moral and religious guidance into the foundation of public school education is the only way to reach some 50% of our school-age population.

No book of this size could possibly deal with all those matters adequately. Yet the author has studied carefully and written wisely. His modest volume might well be brought to the attention of those who need to begin to think about the problem. It should serve its announced purpose, which is "to win consideration and support for" religion in general education and "to trace recent trends of influential thinking in support of the thesis of the book."

RALPH D. HEIM

Konfirmationen i nutidsdebatten. By Axel Melin. Lund: Gleerups Förlag, 1950. 304 pages. Kr. 9:50.

This is not a theological treatise on confirmation, nor is it a history of confirmation. It is rather a survey of the actual situation within the Church of Sweden relative to the observance of confirmation at the present time. The study was undertaken as the basis of a discussion of the subject at a pastoral confer-

ence in Lund in 1950. It is based on statistics, official reports from the different dioceses, and general discussions in various publications. The author has compiled an amazing wealth of facts and viewpoints, covering all phases of the subject.

The book brings out the startling fact that in the midst of the general secularization, especially as it affects church attendance and the place of religious instruction in the public schools, confirmation has maintained itself to a remarkable degree. The author shows from official statistics that 95 per cent of the population over fifteen years of age have been confirmed! Custom and tradition are deeply rooted, but many other customs have been swept away. Then why not confirmation? The author gives various answers, but warns that the absence of opposition to confirmation does not necessarily mean a victory for the church. Open opposition has become apathy and indifferentism.

The real answer seems, however, to be that in spite of all secularization there exists in the inner depths of the people a religious feeling that turns to the church in life's most important moments. And what more important event in life than when youth faces the future with its dangers and its opportunities? At all events, it is a challenging opportunity for the church and the pastor that should be eagerly grasped.

The author discusses the question of confirmation with reference to the age of the confirmands, its relation to general education, religious instruction in the public schools, the material and methods of instruction, psychology of adolescence, Confirmation Day and First Communion. The basis of instruction is Luther's Catechism, but no authorized textbook based on it exists. A large number of such books are, of course, in use, but the most important factor is the pastor's ability to make the Christian truths a living force in the lives of the young people.

OSCAR N. OLSON

The Way to God. By Maxwell Silver. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. 303 pages. \$3.00.

This book makes a deeply philosophic contribution to the Jewish (and Catholic) interpretation of religious faith. But a Lutheran will properly answer its author, a former rabbi, that his way to God is off the track of evangelical faith. When the prophets and the author of Job are understood to offer nothing better than a mystic's way, albeit in a soundly ethical direction, they are simply not being discerned from the perspective of the Gospel. That this limitation is agreeable to Greek ways of thought still does not commend it. How shall we make the "moral assumption" of religious faith in the face of our sorrows and fears today unless we hear a clear Word of God behind the noblest voices of mankind? That Word was indeed spoken to Israel, but the imaginary discourses of Jeremiah and Aristotle which largely compose this book only echo it in part. They do catch its overtones in a fine appreciation of the divine essence as moral personality, but the fundamental tone of God as holy and redeeming love is not perceived. The point is that the truth, the way, and the life of Christian confession must not only be heard by the hearing of the ear, but seen by the eye, in the incarnate Lord.

CHARLES M. COOPER

Das Heilige Mahl im Glauben der Völker. By Fritz Bammel. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950. 199 pages. DM 19.

This is a *religionsgeschichtliche* study. It calls itself a study in religious phenomenology. Its subject is the sacred meal in many of the religions of mankind, from the animistic religions on to those that show largest development. Facts are thus gathered from wide areas. It does not confine itself just to facts but deals even more with the purposes that such meals are meant to serve.

Thus there is the meal that merely serves to nourish or heighten life itself. Here such as aim to increase productivity of field, forest, or even body are collected.

The author next takes up the sociological aspects of sacred meals. They unite clans and communities. There is the further idea of spiritual nourishment even to the extent of nourishing unto eternal life. Over against this there is set also the magical, particularly the meal that seeks revenge on enemies—an eating unto judgment.

Following these detailed discussions, with numerous illustrations drawn from wide fields of investigation, the author concludes with what used to be regarded as the special functions of Comparative Religions. These compare likenesses and differences in the various conceptions of the sacred meal not only in their origin but also in their development.

As already stated, this study is supposed to deal with phenomena, not with interpretation. It is a well known fact that the *Religionsgeschichtliche* students have been among the greatest antagonists

to the idea of a religion of revelation. They would interpret all religion as an evolutionary process that is no more than human development and discovery. The author stops, however, with phenomena and does not venture on interpretation. The reviewer's fear is that the unwary reader may be tempted to draw such a conclusion for himself.

But just as the universality of prayer need not make one conclude that prayer can not rise above the human level, so with the sacred meal. After all, the uniqueness of the Christian religion is not in the outward forms in which religion has expressed itself but in the uniqueness of Christ himself. The uniqueness of the Eucharist is in the uniqueness of the Lord who instituted it and has made it the means whereby we commune with him and he with us. Religion and its practices are universal. Therefore, let us follow the highest and the best. If this is made the rule, this study, as all the many studies in the History of Religion, may serve a useful purpose.

JOHN ABERLY

CONTRIBUTORS

EDMUND SCHLINK is Dean of the Theological Faculty at the University of Heidelberg.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT is professor of Church History at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

REGIN PRENTER is professor of theology at the University of Århus, Denmark.

HAROLD FLOREEN is secretary of the department for the Christian Approach to the Jewish People, Division of American Missions of the National Lutheran Council.

KARL H. HERTZ is professor of sociology at Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

H. T. LEHMANN is president of Waterloo College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

GEORGE DRACH, a pastor of the United Lutheran Church of America, resides at Collegeville, Pa.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are A. J. ENGELBRECHT, professor of the Old Testament in Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque; WILLIAM H. COOPER, professor of the Old Testament in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; HAROLD L. CREAGER, professor of the Old Testament in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; CHARLES M. COOPER, professor of the Old Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; ERIC H. WAHLSTROM, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; RAYMOND T. STAMM, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; JACOB W. HEIKKINEN, associate professor of the New Testament in the same school; E. E. FLACK, dean of Hama Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER, pastor of St. Matthew's Church in Bethlehem, Pa.; PAUL H. ROTH, professor of Church History in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; PAUL H. BUEHRING, professor of Church History in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus; ROBERT H. FISCHER, professor of Church History in the Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; HERMAN A. PREUS, professor of Symbolics in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; ROBERT E. VAN DEUSEN, Washington representative in the National Lutheran Council's Division of Public Relations; EDWARD C. FENDT, dean of Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus; C. G. CARLFELT, professor of Systematic Theology in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; CARL C. RASMUSSEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary; A. D. MATTSON, professor of Ethics in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; OSCAR N. OLSON, historian of the Augustana Church, Rock Island.